

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XVI, No. 3.

MARCH, 1939

## BLESSED GRIGNON DE MONTFORT AND THE LAST TIMES

THE faith of the Catholic who should say that devotion to Our Lady weakens devotion to her divine Son would be suspect. Faith itself is both the source and the guarantee of a right devotion: the source, because it sanctions the title of Mother of God; the guarantee, because the title itself was, in the words of Cardinal Newman, "given in order to protect the doctrine of the Incarnation, and to preserve the faith of Catholics from a specious Humanitarianism".<sup>1</sup> Nor for the Catholic is a profound devotion to the Mother of God an unbalanced devotion, for her very relationship as Mother of God and spouse of the Holy Ghost must necessarily correct any tendency to false bias.

"The Divine Maternity is the destructive weapon like against heresies that would exalt her or lower her," says Terrien.<sup>2</sup> And the only heresy which has ever presumed to exalt her is not the product of the twentieth century, which has an office of the Mediatrix, but an exaggeration of the fourth century, before the Council of Ephesus. The Collyridians, condemned by St. Epiphanius, seem to have offered sacrifice to Our Lady, transferring to her the worship which in certain pagan communities had been given to the goddess Ceres. It is true that Benedict XIV in his work on the Canonization of Saints also condemns a devotion to Our Lady in the Blessed Sacrament that had no basis in sound theology, but this is not the status of a formal heresy.

Devotion to Our Lady may not be a subject for

<sup>1</sup> *Development of Christian Doctrine.*

<sup>2</sup> *La Mère de Dieu*, tome 1<sup>er</sup>, sixième édition, p. 52.

criticism by a Catholic ; methods of devotion, or the manner in which any writer speaks about it, may. And writers on Our Lady of more modern times, in particular Blessed Grignon de Montfort and those who have followed him in propagating his *True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin*, have been subjected to severe criticism by just those whose own zeal for all that honours Our Lady is above question. The criticism has in part been directed against what is said to be an exaggerated and fanciful style in de Montfort's writings. He has shared, perhaps undeservedly, the literary unpopularity of "the saintly" Father Faber, his chief exponent, and in consequence he has rarely been judged on his own merits.

Whatever may be said about the literary style of de Montfort, it is a startling fact that Faber himself found great difficulty in digesting the treatise on "True Devotion". He had been acquainted with it as far back as 1846, but he could still write to Watts Russell sixteen years later, and only a year and eight months before his own death : "It is a great delight to me that the Nihil obstat of the Congregation of Rites testifies that all is right. But with my present low attainments I am unable to embrace it. . . . But parts jar me beyond what I can tell you ; and after twice studying the report of the proceedings in the 'Analecta Juris Pontificii', I cannot but feel that while the answer of the Avvocato dei Santi proves that the objections establish nothing in him against faith or morals, it does no more. It fails to bring the teaching home to me as acceptable doctrine."<sup>1</sup>

Against the hesitating acceptance of Father Faber, who, as the event proved, has shown himself to have caught more than any other man the true spirit of de Montfort, we have the emphatic declarations of others in authority who cannot be accused of fanciful oratorical flights or sentimental exaggerations in

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Letters of F. W. Faber*—J. E. Bowden, pp. 428-9.

devotion. Herbert, Bishop of Salford, in a Letter to the Clergy of his Diocese of November 1, 1883, said : "De Montfort's Treatise on True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin appeals strongly to the intellect as it does to the heart. Any one who has really mastered it will feel that his consecration to Mary has been sensibly raised to a higher plane, and flooded with new light. He will also see its close and important connection with the renewal of his baptismal vows." And, "To consecrate oneself to her is an instinct of Catholic faith, and a practice very widely spread among the Catholic laity in England, as well as among the clergy." Monsignor Newsham, the President of Ushaw College, also wrote about de Montfort's treatise, and recommended it in all directions. Dr. Ward defended in the *Dublin Review* the teaching of de Montfort against Pusey. But perhaps the most valuable testimony is from one who holds no brief for de Montfort ; who was, on the contrary, one of the examiners engaged by the *Advocatus Diaboli*. Giving his formal judgment, he said : "I must begin by confessing the impression produced in me by reading the precious writings of this venerable servant of God. I have experienced an interior unction, a peace, and a consolation which the writings of highly favoured servants of God, of servants of God endowed with lights and with sanctity of an extraordinary kind, are known frequently to produce. This impression was profound and sweet to the highest degree." And over and above all these weighty recommendations is the judgment of the Holy See, whose highest approbation of the teaching of a servant of God is, as Pope Benedict XIV has shown, a negative one : "that it has not been reprobated".

Although objections have been framed against the form of de Montfort's presentation of his teaching, the real objective of the critics lies usually much deeper than that. Generally it is not even his method of

devotion that is attacked. The criticism is much more against the general dissemination of de Montfort's teaching. De Montfort himself admits that "it is true that we can attain to divine union by other roads", but whereas his critics regard his method of devotion as a thing for a few, he himself advocates it for the many. The treatise, however, is not at first sight without some ambiguity on this point. For there are passages in which the author treats of his method as if it were adapted specially for souls well advanced in perfection; he even speaks of it as a "secret". In one place he says: "The practice which I am about to disclose is one of these secrets of grace unknown by the greater number of Christians, known even to few of the devout, and practised and relished by a far less number still." In another part of the "Treatise" he says: "As the essential of this devotion consists in the interior which it ought to form, it will not be equally comprehended by everybody." The method itself almost anticipates in him who practices it a more than ordinary insight into the doctrines of the Mediatrix and of divine grace.

There is, however, no inconsistency in de Montfort's teaching. Understanding is a Gift of almost infinite degrees. It is the common heritage of all who are sons of God by sanctifying grace. Every soul has its "secret". "*Secretum meum mihi*" is in one sense a warning against divulging it. But it is more than that. It is also a statement of the truth that the soul's secret is a thing which of its own nature cannot be divulged. Nevertheless it is a thing which, paradoxically, is at once individual and shared. It is in the first place a compact between Christ and the soul; but secondly a compact in which all Christ's members have a common interest, because of the life-blood of grace which they share in common. Any method, therefore, that has an easily understood outward performance, and that is not essentially interior and



supernatural in the strict sense, is not to be kept from common knowledge, even though the proper interior practice of it implies a certain degree of perfection. The call to perfection itself is primarily universal, although in fact few take it.

There is another passage in Blessed Grignon's *Treatise on True Devotion* which would seem to be very damaging to his thesis. He says, speaking of the method he advocates: "There have been some Saints, but they have been in small numbers, who have passed by this sweet path to go to Jesus. . . . But the rest of the Saints, who are the greater number, although they have all had devotion to our Blessed Lady, have not on that account or at least very little, entered upon this way." Why, then, should he wish to impose on the majority of Christians a method which seems certainly to have been known in the Church from ancient times (there are records of the practice of it in the eleventh century), but which nearly all the faithful, canonized Saints included, have hitherto got on very well without?

The answer to this question is fundamental to de Montfort's thesis. It may be stated briefly thus: Just as Christ came by Mary in the Incarnation, so will His Second Coming be by Mary in a spiritual manner. She, in whose womb the Body of Christ was formed, must form the Mystical Body of Christ, that it may be complete at the last day, and as Mediatrix must obtain for men the crowning grace of the Second Coming of Christ.

The "True Devotion" advocated by Blessed Grignon de Montfort is essentially a devotion for the Last Times; the last ages of the Church which will precede the end of the world. Speaking of increase of devotion to Our Lady, de Montfort says: "I have said that this would come to pass particularly at the end of the world, and indeed presently, because the Most High with His Holy Mother has to form to

Himself great Saints, who shall surpass most of the other Saints in sanctity." Father Faber speaks of "that sublime augmentation of devotion to Our Blessed Lady, which the prophecies and revelations of holy men and women have announced as the characteristic of the last Saints, who shall precede the Doom".<sup>1</sup> Herbert, Bishop of Salford, in the letter to his clergy already referred to, associating St. Joseph with Our Lady's special office of Mediatrix, says: "He will have part and lot with her and with the Church during those latter ages of the world when the struggle between good and evil shall become intensified."

No exact deductions can be made as to the sequence of the signs which Our Lord foretold would precede the last judgment. And apart from Our Lord's own words, the Church has not pronounced on any of the other passages of Holy Scripture which commentators have interpreted as referring to the Last Times. There is, however, a Commentary on the Apocalypse, by the Venerable Barthelemi Holzhauser, who died in Germany in 1658, which carries a good deal of weight for two reasons. First, because he had the reputation of great sanctity, was said to have had the gift of prophecy, and claimed to have written his Commentary by special illumination. Secondly, because there is a remarkable agreement between his prophecies and those of St. Catherine of Siena, St. Hildegarde, Blessed Anna Maria Taigi, and a number of other holy women who have foretold the events of the last ages of the Church. There is, admittedly, some difficulty in distinguishing between the spurious and the genuine, and in the interpretation of symbolism in the prophecies, but a quotation from the *Civiltà Cattolica* of May 4, 1872 provides a very reasonable summing-up on the credence that should be given to these prophecies: "We protest once more that it is not in our mind to put forward as authentic any of

<sup>1</sup> *Precious Blood.*

the prophecies recorded by us. It belongs to the Church to judge of their supernatural origin. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the agreement of so many and various presages in defining events the expectation of which is in the heart of the greater number of Catholics possesses a persuasive force and is a kind of seal of high probability, if not of certainty."

In whatever way these prophecies differ in detail, they are all in striking agreement that the persecution of the Church by the devil will be very greatly intensified during the last ages. They are themselves together a commentary on Apoc. xii, 12: "Woe to the earth, and to the sea, because the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time." De Montfort in his *Treatise on True Devotion*, says: "The devil, knowing that he has but little time, and now less than ever, to destroy souls, will every day redouble his efforts and his combats. He will presently raise up new persecutions." He enlarges, moreover, on the enmity between Our Lady and the devil predicted in Genesis; he even goes so far as to say that the devil "fears her not only more than all Angels and men, but in some sense more than God Himself". He goes on to explain this by saying: "It is not that the anger, the hatred, and the power of God are not infinitely greater than those of the Blessed Virgin, for the perfections of Mary are limited, but it is, first, because Satan, being proud, suffers infinitely more from being beaten and punished by a little and humble handmaid of God, and her humility humbles him more than the Divine power."

This teaching only maintains a principle which is only too often overlooked or misunderstood in popular speech and modes of thought—the principle that there can be no sort of competition between God and the devil. The enmity is emphatically "between thee and the woman" (Gen. iii, 15), as between crea-

ture and creature ; between "thy seed and her seed". It is the devil himself who would persuade men that he is God-like ; and where he cannot persuade them to serve him openly he subtly introduces an unwholesome fear of himself—a specious Manicheism. The Christian's choice is not primarily between God and the devil ; it is between God and creatures ; between God and not-God. To acknowledge Our Lady as the vanquisher of Satan is not to lower the dignity of her Divine Son ; on the contrary Our Blessed Lord is thereby exalted, for His Divinity is emphasized, and at the same time the subjection of all creatures to Him in His Sacred Humanity. Moreover, any false notion of competition between Creator and creature not only lowers the conception of God ; it detracts also from the dignity of creatures. It is a consequence of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ that supernaturalized man takes his rightful place as a partner in the work of the Redemption. Any stress, therefore, that is placed on man's reparatory vocation, pre-eminently illustrated by Our Lady's unique position in the Divine economy of the Redemption, protects the doctrine of the Mystical Body and the dignity of Christ's members.

The instrumentality of Our Lady in the warfare against Satan is paralleled in the warfare of heaven. It is not God Himself who banishes the rebel angels ; it is St. Michael acting for Him. "And there was a great battle in heaven, Michael and his angels fought with the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels" (Apoc. xii, 7). And although Our Lord in His miracles of physical healing exorcised the possessed, the exorcism, either explicit or implied, which accompanies the spiritual regeneration of Baptism He always delegated. The exorcisms in the Rite of Baptism serve to emphasize not so much the dominion of Christ over the devil as the power over the devil which He gives to His Church. And

that power is also the prerogative of Our Lady, because of her intimate relationship with the Church as Mediatrix of All Graces, a relationship on which the inspired analogies of the Cantic of Canticles throw much illumination.

But when all is said and done, few of de Montfort's critics have any wish to quarrel with his theology. Most admit the soundness of the thesis which would give to the Mother of God the right to protect her children in Christ from the powers of darkness. But there are many who, while granting this, deny, or at least question, the necessity for particular devotional advertence to it. It is not possible to appreciate the reason for de Montfort's insistence on this method unless it is understood as an extraordinary aid against exceptional perils and pitfalls. It is not so much the open hostility of Antichrist which he has in view—and if little can be said with certainty about Antichrist, his appearance ultimately is at any rate a constant tradition in the Church. It is rather the preceding "cruel persecutions of the devil, which shall go on increasing daily till the reign of Antichrist" that he would chiefly have the faithful prepare themselves against. And a distinguishing mark of the devil's warfare, and that which in practice may be said to make it difficult to distinguish as warfare, is subtlety. Human skill and experience are no match for the devil. The true Christian, indeed, at no time relies on himself in the Christian warfare, but on God. Nevertheless, reliance on God does not exclude but implies reliance on means, both natural and supernatural. In the life of the good Christian, the human and the divine become inextricable, so that the counsellor of souls cannot help but become in part a human counsellor as well. But the evil one is capable of waging a constant warfare in the everyday life of men with such subtlety that the traps he lays for them have the

appearance of solid ground. Doubtless he will do that in the last ages. The Christian needs a constant counsellor, one always at hand, who is cleverer than Satan, and can forestall him. To quote Blessed Grignion once again: "But the humble Mary will always have the victory over that proud spirit. . . . She will always discover the malice of the serpent. She will always counterwork his infernal mines and dissipate his diabolical counsels, and will guarantee even to the end of time her faithful servants from his cruel claw. But the power of Mary over all the devils will especially break out in the latter times, when Satan will lay snares against her heel; that is to say, her humble slaves and her poor children, whom she will raise up to make war against him."

Many have taken exception to the title "Slaves of Mary" given to those who consecrate themselves to her in accordance with de Montfort's method. This is partly due to the fact that certain practices of an association called the Confraternity of the Slaves of the Mother of God were formally condemned. De Montfort's method is not, of course, involved. It is, indeed, more lustrous in contrast with the spurious devotion. And de Montfort, that he might not be misunderstood, took great care to emphasize that the slavery he advocated was "the slavery of Jesus in Mary". The critics who object to the title "slave" he anticipates by pointing out that the term "Mancipia Christi" is sanctioned by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and that even the Pauline "Servus Christi" has the same meaning, since the "servants" of St. Paul's time were "slaves".

Those who as Slaves of Mary look to her for continual help and protection in the Christian warfare give into her hands not only themselves, but also all their good works, and the value of them, that she may dispose of them as she pleases. Again in the words

of Blessed Grignon, "you abandon your own intentions and operations, although good and known, to lose yourself, so to speak, in the intentions of the Blessed Virgin, although they are unknown".<sup>1</sup> This is not to say that the Slave should have no particular intentions ; it only implies that he is willing to forgo them in favour of any that the Mother of God should see to be more urgent or fitting.

There are some who have seen in this offering a form of Quietism. But de Montfort himself has anticipated even this objection. For at the end of a short commentary on the words of St. Augustine : "Si formam Dei te appellem, digna existis," he says : "without trusting to their own skill, but only in the goodness of the mould, they cast themselves and lose themselves in Mary, to become the portraits of Jesus Christ after nature". And then, as if to the critics : "But remember that we only cast in a mould what is melted and liquid ; that is to say, you must destroy and melt down in yourself the old Adam to become the new one in Mary." The energy and resolution required, in fact, by the initial offering, precludes any tendency to Quietistic indolence. And although the offering is not necessarily that of a victim, it implies the offerer's consent to be employed ; it is pre-eminently a devotion of doing.

Another objection that has often been urged against the method of de Montfort is this : that it gives predominance in the imagination to Our Lady instead of to Our Lord. But a close analysis of his method reveals, on the contrary, that it is essentially Christocentric. It is not just pious enthusiasm or extravagance that led him to give to the practice he advocates the name of the "*True Devotion to Our Blessed Lady*". It is true, in his view, just because it does not monopolize the imagination, as the critics suggest it does, and as other and lesser forms of

<sup>1</sup> *Treatise on True Devotion.*

devotion to Our Lady may tend to do. Surrendering as he does himself, his good works, and all relatively unimportant things, the Slave of Mary is enabled to focus his whole attention on the Person of Christ. "Jesus Christ our Saviour," says de Montfort, "true God and true Man, ought to be the last end of all our other devotions, else they are false and delusive." Again : "If, then, we establish the solid devotion to Our Blessed Lady, it is only to establish more perfectly the devotion to Jesus Christ." And just as the religious, by the vows of poverty and obedience surrenders his possessions and will, so that he may find fewer impediments in the following of Christ, so does the Slave of Mary surrender to her those things which may distract him from true devotion to Christ.

C. J. WOOLLEN.



## FAMILY ALLOWANCES

It is a pleasure to observe that the system of Family Allowances, long favoured among Catholic social reformers, and originated by Catholic employers mindful of the Catholic doctrine of the Living Wage, is now receiving widespread and influential support in England. The system, in various degrees and various forms, exists in a large number of Continental countries and in Australia and New Zealand, and it is being strongly advocated in Canada.

Family allowances represent an attempt to adjust the remuneration of the worker according to his particular family needs, as measured by the number of his dependent children. This adjustment has always been made in unemployment insurance benefits, in poor relief, and in the separation allowances for the wives and children of men serving with the Colours. I think that if a survey were made it would be found that the principle of payment according to need as well as services rendered finds recognition in a great deal of private employment. It is traditional for coalminers in some parts of England to receive free house and coal when they are married men. A distinction has also been made between the subsistence wages of married and unmarried men, the former being paid at a higher rate. The first eight years of my working life were spent in a toy-making factory; it was a low-paid trade, but the married men were favoured as against the single men, and the older men were most distinctly favoured as compared with the younger men. There were certain jobs, paid for by the piece, which were more remunerative than others to the worker, and the foreman usually gave these jobs to the married men. My impression is that the factory was typical of most others in this respect, perhaps less so now than in my factory days

thirty years ago, owing to the growth of big industry and also of trade unions and legal minimum wages, all of which tend to relate wages exclusively to output without regard to the individual circumstances of the worker. So far as there is a custom of promotion according to seniority there is some increase of payment according to increase of needs. But the tendency of industry has been to become more ruthlessly "rationalized", which often means more dehumanized, to think only of the job and not of the man.

The system of Family Allowances does not conform to the principle of equal pay for equal work. This principle has, in my opinion, only a limited and relative validity. No doubt its operation is practically necessary when exactly the same kind of work is being done by different workers in the same place, as when there are a team of weavers at looms in a cotton mill. But the present wage system has never secured even approximate equality of payment for equal skill, effort and sacrifice as between trade and trade. Everyone knows of the disparities between the "sheltered" and "unsheltered" trades, between the wages of those employed by employers subject to competition and those fortunate enough to be in the service of municipalities, especially when the municipal councils are dominated by Labour. In Toronto, where I live, an electric tram driver, or a bus driver, employed by a public commission, gets nearly twice the wage of the ordinary truck driver in private employment, though the latter may have equal ability and works under far harder conditions. No doubt readers can think of plenty of similar disparities in England. The persistent payment of women at lower rates than men is not to be explained by dissimilarity of the work but by a traditional belief, right or wrong, that women need less than men. Ethical writers sometimes give themselves a good deal of trouble to justify departures from the principle

equal pay for equal work, but practical men of the world have never held it sacrosanct for they have not found it generally applied, except, as I have said, when the different pieces of work have been identical in kind. Equal pay is then necessary to avoid discontent and evoke the maximum effort.

Some Catholic ethical writers, while favouring family allowances in practice, are meticulous in emphasizing that this is not the ideal system, since every adult worker has, in abstract justice, a right to family living wage even if he has no family to support. But it appears certain that industry, as at present constituted, cannot pay a family living wage to all workers, including those without families. Nor has anybody shown, to the satisfaction of impartial judges, how industry could be reconstituted to increase so vastly the total wage-bill. Hence it seems permissible to leave the abstract question on one side and give our attention to the practical possibilities. The Belgian Confederation of Christian Trade Unions in May 1933 published a statement from which the following passage may be quoted :

Family allowances are the only really practical method of ensuring that families with children to support shall have an income sufficient to enable them to live decently. If we were to demand for the father of a large family a wage enabling him to bring up his four or five children properly, we should be placing a burden on industry which it would be unable to bear, for no exception can be made to the rule of "equal pay for equal work", so that we should also have to demand the same wage for all his fellow workers, even those who are unmarried. Family allowances, on the contrary, enable wages to be calculated on the basis of the needs of a household without dependent children, always provided that the allowances are large enough to cover the cost of maintenance of each child for whom they are paid. It is true that in the past the Confederation demanded a family wage, calculated on the basis of a family of four,

Vol. xvi.

consisting of father, mother, and two dependent children, but experience has shown this basis to be impracticable in Belgium, because there are a large number of childless couples for whom it is impossible to claim an income adequate to support a family of four.

As trade union demands, these would strike the English reader as disconcertingly modest, but they show that the Christian Confederation of Belgium approaches the wage question on a basis of realism. In England Mr. Seebohm Rowntree is quoted as saying that the wages of an unskilled labourer are normally sufficient to keep a man and wife and small family in moderate comfort, but are inadequate for the bare physical necessities of a family where there are more than three dependent children. Children are not an easier burden for the better-paid workers, who must spend proportionally as well as absolutely more on rent, clothing and education. The case for family allowances applies to all classes of wage-earners and to most salary earners.

Public employers, and some private employers, could, if they wished, pay family allowances on their own initiative. There are numerous countries where the system now applies to civil servants. To make the system general, however, there must be organized action by all the employers of an industry or region, or there must be action by the State. The simplest system is that of New Zealand, where the State pays allowances, out of its general revenues, to low-income families with more than two children. While this system has the merit of simplicity, and of helping the poorest, it fails to help the better-paid workers who, when they have more than two children, really need help, and, moreover, the system has the appearance of being a public alms to the poor instead of a payment for services rendered.

In Australia there is a long-established system of the legal regulation of wages. It has been the system

to establish what purported to be a living wage, based on the needs of a conventional family unit. The unit during many years consisted of a man, wife and two dependent children. In 1927 the State of New South Wales enacted one piece of legislation to make the unit consist of man and wife only, which would reduce the basic wage, and another piece of legislation to make allowances of five shillings a week payable for each child in a family. The allowances were to be financed by a tax on the wage-bills of employers. After much controversy new legislation was passed at the end of 1929, making man, wife and one child the unit for establishing the basic living wage, and paying family allowances only for children after the first, and only to families whose income does not exceed the basic living wage. The allowances are paid out of a tax of one per cent on wage-bills of employers. The New South Wales system is less restricted than the New Zealand system, but it is less extended than we would desire it to be.

We now turn to France, the country to which we owe this great social invention of family allowances. Like many other inventions, its development was effected by a series of steps. The first step was taken during the Great War by one or two large employers in Grenoble. To meet the increasing cost of living they made special supplements (*sursalaires*) to the wages of their employees, according to the number of children dependent on their earnings. Many pre-war examples of family allowances to employees, in France and elsewhere, could be quoted, but the importance of the Grenoble initiative lies in the fact that other employers in the district joined to establish a fund to which each contributed on an equal basis, according to the number of their employees or their total wage-bill, and from this fund, called an equalization fund, the workers with dependants received special allowances. The equalization

fund was needed so that the employer paying family allowances would not be penalized if his employees happened to have more than the proportionate number of dependents. With an equalization fund family allowances gave no inducement to an employer to discriminate against family men in giving employment.

From Grenoble the system spread to other regions and to many industries. The initiative was taken by employers and their action was voluntary. Sometimes the grouping of employers to establish equalization funds was by locality, sometimes by industry. There were six funds in France in 1919, covering 230 establishments and 50,000 workers. In 1929 there were 229 funds, covering 25,000 establishments with 1,740,000 workers and paying allowances totalling 292 million francs. This growth had been effected without any compulsion upon employers by the State, except that contractors for public works had been required to affiliate to equalization funds.

There had long been a general feeling that the results of family allowances were so beneficial to the community as a whole that a minority of employers, "chisellers" President Roosevelt would call them, should not be allowed to refuse the responsibilities that the majority had willingly assumed. In 1932 an Act was passed which made it obligatory for all regular employers in industry, commerce, agriculture and the liberal professions, to join an approved equalization fund. The Act did not so much set up new machinery as give a legal status to machinery already established by the voluntary initiative of the employers. The Act left the working of the funds largely to the discretion of the members. It did not say what contributions employers had to pay or what should be the rates of allowances to workers, except that the allowances should not be lower than those already prevailing in the voluntary schemes, and that

minimum rates might be established for certain regions and industries by decree. The contributions of the employers must naturally be sufficient to pay the allowances, but the members of the funds collectively decide how they shall be assessed, whether by number of workers, number of days worked, amount of wage-bill, area of land under cultivation in the case of agriculture, and so on. The allowances are paid for all children up to 13 years of age, or up to 16 if the child continues at school or is apprenticed. There is no limitation to the children of lower-paid workers. The families of high-salaried technicians and managers benefit under the scheme.

The rates of allowance vary in France from one district to another, the lowest being 15 francs a month for the first child and the highest being 30 francs for the first child. It is usual to pay more for a second child than a first, more for a third than a second, and so on ascending. I have given some figures above of the growth of voluntary equalization funds from 1919 to 1929. In 1934 the funds covered 100,000 establishments and 3,400,000 workers, and distributed 565 million francs in allowances.

From France we pass to Belgium, where also the first efforts were made voluntarily by employers, and in 1928 the State made family allowances compulsory for contractors for public works. In 1930 the compulsion was extended to all employers, including public authorities. The Belgian law established a national uniformity absent from the French; there could be voluntarily formed equalization funds but there had to be uniform rates of contributions and allowances. By the law of 1930 the monthly rate of allowances was 15 francs for the first child, 20 francs for the second child, 40 francs for the third, 70 francs for the fourth, and 100 francs for each child after the fourth. The employer's contribution was at the rate of 65 centimes per day worked for each male employee

and 35 centimes for each female employee. The State gave a subsidy. The law began its operation in a period of severe depression and was difficult to enforce. An Order of January 1935 reduced employers' contributions to 50 centimes for males and 25 centimes for females. Allowances were reduced proportionately.

In the voluntary era of 1929 Belgium had equalization funds covering 3825 establishments and 581,000 workers and dispensing 92,630,000 francs in allowances. In 1933 when compulsion was largely in operation but not entirely in operation there were 88 funds covering 96,497 establishments and 1,277,673 workers with 885,030 children. The allowances totaled 249,369,071 francs.

Italy started family allowances less than five years ago and already she rivals France and Belgium in the universality of the system. The concentration of authority and the subordination of private to public interests, which are features of Fascism, have enabled a rapid tempo to be attained. Yet even in Italy the process shows a degree of experimentalism and gradualness. The first steps were taken in the textile trade in the district of Biella, where it seems that the workers' organization asked for family allowances and these were made part of a collective contract with the employers who financed them by a contribution equal to one per cent of their wage-bill. Soon afterwards, in October 1934, a huge extension was made by a collective agreement between the federations representing all "industrial" workers and employers. "Industrial" here means manual productive work as distinct from agriculture, commerce, finance, handicrafts, the professions, etc. About 2 million workers were involved in the scheme, but this does not mean that that number received allowances, for workers without dependents have to have their contributions deducted. Moreover, under this original scheme the



e. The allowances were paid only to men working not more than 40 hours a week. The scheme was initiated as compensation for short-time imposed on the workers in the Italian industry. The workers as well as the employers paid contributions to finance the allowances. I believe that it is only in Italy where the workers contribute directly for the payment of family allowances, but as will be shown in a moment, they receive far more than they pay.

A new and wider basis for family allowances in Italy was established by a Legislative Decree of August 1936, when the whole system of contributions and allowances, for the industrial workers, became determined by law instead of resting upon a collective agreement. Moreover, the allowances became payable irrespective of the number of hours worked, in the connection with short-time was abolished and this added scores of thousands to the number of workers eligible for allowances. Further, the State became a contributor to the expenses and provision was made in anticipation of the extension of the scheme to workers other than industrial. As already stated the number of industrial workers involved was about 4 millions. Of these about 800,000 are family breadwinners with a total of about 1,700,000 dependent children under 14 years of age. The cost of the scheme in 1937 was estimated at 344 million lire, of which 215 millions were contributed by employers, 86 millions by workers and 43 millions by the State. The Italian workers may be said to get much more than the historic ninepence for fourpence with which Mr. Lloyd George beguiled the British masses on the introduction of State Health Insurance.

At the beginning of 1937 there came into operation a scheme of family allowances collectively agreed upon between commercial workers and their employers. The commercial workers affected total about 350,000. The employers' contribution was

fixed at 2.5 per cent and the workers' contribution at 1 per cent of the average monthly earnings. The allowances are at the rate of 20 or 25 lire monthly according as the workers monthly earnings are more or less than 600 lire, for every dependent child under 15 years of age.

There is also a scheme of family allowances in a collective agreement affecting credit and insurance undertakings. No contribution is paid by workers who earn less than 3000 lire a year, other workers contribute 5 lire a month; the bulk of the cost of the allowances is borne by the employers, but the State may make a contribution if needed. The allowances vary according to different categories of workers, but they are payable to a husband on behalf of his wife, not only on behalf of his dependent children, and they are payable for dependent children up to 18 years of age. Allowances are payable also for dependent parents. It is estimated that there are some 70,000 credit and insurance workers affected by this scheme.

Enough has been said to show that family allowances are not mere utopianism; they are a strongly established, widespread and accepted system in modern social life. They have the same prestige as, say, National Health Insurance. They are called for by social justice, and I think this is their best title to adoption, but there is no doubt of the fact that they have been promoted by European Governments because they may be presumed to encourage an increase of the birth rate. It is obvious that Great Britain will soon be obliged to adopt drastic measures to improve the fertility of her population unless she is content to surrender her Imperial position. Here in Canada, where I write, the British cause is perhaps already lost. The French-speaking element, only 28 per cent of the population at the last census, have as many children as the British (those of English, Scots, Irish or Welsh descent) who were 52 per cent of the

population at the last census. The remaining 20 per cent of the population are of various nationalities, German, Italian, Polish, Ukrainian, Finnish, etc. They will be English-speaking, not French-speaking, but they will not have the same sentiments towards the Empire as have immigrants from Britain or the children of immigrants from Britain. It is only by immigration that British predominance in Canada has been maintained so long, and British immigration is now a minus quantity; there are more returning from Canada to Britain than leaving Britain for Canada. Britain has ceased to be a Mother Country. She has no surplus population, no young people to spare. How then can she hope to maintain the British character of the Dominions? These equal one-seventh of the world's area and have only one-seventy-fifth of the world's population. We can hardly be surprised that Germany, Italy and Japan have comments to make.

To refer to the unpopulated British Empire may seem to be a digression from the subject of family allowances, but it is not so. The first thing required to establish family allowances in Britain is an aroused public opinion. If employers, taxpayers and wage-earners think simply of themselves and their own interests family allowances will not be popular, at least the necessary contributions will not be popular, and democratic politicians will take no initiative in the matter. I assume that nothing will be done in Britain without legislation, for the relations between organized capital and organized labour in Britain are not such as to be productive of such efforts and agreements as introduced family allowances on the Continent. The difficulties regarding family allowances are not economic or administrative. The British civil service, which has handled unemployment insurance, would find family allowances child's play. What is needed is a national realization that fruitful family

life is necessary if Britain is not to perish. Family allowances by themselves would not stop the rot in a country where, as we read with shame in Canada, contraceptives are obtainable from slot machines; they would not make selfish people assume the burdens of parenthood, but they would do something to lessen the difficulties of those married folk who are heroically doing their duty. The restoration of the sense of duty where it has been lost is the prime need. It is only to those who increase and multiply that God has given the commission to fill the earth and subdue it.

HENRY SOMERVILLE.

## A RE-READING OF "PIERS PLOWMAN"

THE issue, some three years ago, of a fresh rendering, by Professor Wells, of William Langland's *Vision of Piers Plowman*, has given that fourteenth-century poem a new lease of life. The Introduction to this modern version, by Professor Coghill, presents the reader with the latest conclusions reached by scholars with regard to this remarkable but enigmatic work. With this guide, we find that what else might have seemed a mass of dull allegory, interspersed with vivid but unconnected pictures of medieval life, acquires unity and meaning. But for the understanding of a poem such as this, learning is not the only requisite. One must be able to enter intimately into the writer's faith and view the world from his religious standpoint. And it is here, I think, that Neville Coghill has failed.

I refer particularly to his interpretation of the central figure in the poem, Piers Plowman himself. It may be granted offhand that Piers' is a baffling personality. Without much warning he passes from one rôle to another. Just as you have made up your mind about him and assigned him to a particular category, you find him in a quite different guise. At first one is tempted to think that the poet has used the name as a common term for any ideal of which he might happen to approve and had carelessly allowed these different symbolic figures to overlap each other. The Introduction happily saves us from this error. It makes clear the fact that Piers stands for three distinct types. He is, first, the good, honest farmer suggested by his name, the embodiment of all the lay virtues. In his second phase he becomes the instructor of the ignorant, the pastor of erring souls and, thus, a symbol of the priesthood. But there is, says his interpreter, a third phase. In this "he is entrusted with the building of the Church of

Christ, whose authority is committed to him, to save Christendom from the forces of wickedness within and without the soul. . . . It is not difficult to see in this embodiment of the life of Church authority, the Bishop's life . . ."

Now this arrangement omits what Langland would surely have considered the most important point in his portraiture of Piers. Not only does he tell us categorically that Piers Plowman is Christ, but he also represents him as doing what Christ did—suffering on the Cross, descending into Hell and rising from the dead. From the literary point of view the peak point of the poem is that section which describes the "harrowing of Hell" and the encounter of Christ, clad "in Piers' armour" with Lucifer. The identification is complete, and it is strange that the commentator should give the impression that he had overlooked it. The three divisions into which the story of the hero falls are, it seems to me, clear enough. In the first Piers is the peasant farmer indicated by the term "Plowman", in the second he is the symbol of St. Peter, or the Church, as suggested by his first name, but, covering both these rôles, is the third which I have mentioned, that, namely, which identifies him with Our Lord Himself.

Now this is not merely a question of academic interest. The precise meaning of a medieval poem, at this time of day, if it were merely a question of scholarship and right understanding, might be left to those concerned with such matters. In the present case, however, much more is involved. The combination under one name of functions so diverse as those of Christ, the Church and the Catholic layman is too strange to be accidental or due to the poet's bungling. It has a profound significance, and it is this significance which, I venture to think, Professor Coghill has missed. It is a significance which even those who share Langland's Faith might miss were it

not that it illustrates a truth which is becoming increasingly prominent at the present time.

In order to indicate the source from which the poet probably derived his idea, and to make clear what that idea is, we shall have to go back to the teaching of St. Paul. In the Epistles of the great Apostle we find Christ identified in the closest possible manner with His Church. That Church is not simply an organization which He formed and endowed ; it is His Own Body, the living organism of which He is the animating principle, the indwelling life. So strongly does this conception possess the mind of St. Paul that he even declares that, though we may have known Christ after the flesh, we know Him so no more. The historical Jesus has been absorbed in and re-presented by the Mystical Body which is His incarnate Presence in the world today. The Jesus of the Gospels thus becomes a contemporary fact. What else would have been only a memory is given us as an actual experience. The doctrine is one which, for many centuries, has been allowed to fall into the background, but is now being recovered. In his work on *The Whole Christ*, Emile Mersch, S.J., says, referring to this doctrine : "The Augustinian tradition that had been so characteristic a feature of the early Middle Ages suffers a gradual decline during the age of the Scholastics. One notices at the first contact with their works that the doctrine of the Mystical Body no longer occupies its position of prominence ; rarely is it mentioned, and even then it is spoken of with great moderation." It is not that, in the age under consideration, the mystical element was lacking in current devotional literature. It is the Golden Age of Catholic Mysticism. And particularly was this the case, if we advance from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century, in England. Such a galaxy of mystical writers as that in which we find the names of Mother Juliana, Richard Rolle,

Walter Hilton and the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing* had not occurred before and has not occurred since. But in none of these do we find other than an individualistic mysticism. Christ approaches the soul in His Own Proper Person and not as incarnate in the Church. The mysticism of these writers is, in this respect, quite different from that of St. Paul. But here, in this lonely fourteenth-century poet, we find clearly enunciated in poetic terms that conception which Father Mersch declares to have been forgotten by the Middle Ages. That fact alone would entitle Langland's poem to some consideration. No doubt the obscurity in which the doctrine has lain during the intervening centuries accounts in some measure for the obscurity which his own work has suffered. Now that the Pauline conception is again coming into its own, it is to be hoped that Langland's prophetic anticipation will receive due recognition.

But we have not exhausted the parallel between the idea presented by *Piers Plowman* and the movement of thought in our own time. The Church, as seen by the poet, is not fully represented by ecclesiastics. Though these have prior place, they need the complement of a co-operating laity, each member of which performs his allotted task in the human commonwealth, serving God by proving faithful in his secular vocation. Piers, who is both Christ and Peter, is also a plowman. And it is precisely in the identification of these three rôles with the same person that the profoundest significance of the poem lies. Christianity, for Langland, was an integral thing. Christ is the Head not only of the ecclesiastical organism, but of the entire Christian commonwealth, and there is no part of life with the sanctification of which we, as members of His Body, are not concerned. Langland, carrying with him his consciousness of Christ as the unifying and directing principle of human society, descends to the very dregs of that society. He



takes us with him into the London stews. When others make excuse for not accompanying Piers on his pilgrimage, a woman of the streets volunteers to go with him. This vision of the Catholic life takes in the whole panorama of human activities. The realization of the poet's ideal would mean both a "new heaven" and "a new earth".

We shall recognize at once in this the note which is becoming the dominant one of our times and which may be said to express the very spirit of Catholic action. Five centuries before it was launched an English poet, writing in troubled times, anticipated the main idea of this movement. Mersch's use of the term, "The Whole Christ", is an unconscious echo of Langland's thought. That thought is conveyed even more clearly by the title which the late Abbot Vonier gave to his book on the Mystical Body—*The People of God*. The reasons he gave for the choice of this term are, in the present connection, suggestive. "I think that our understanding of the mystery of Christ's Church," he wrote, "ought not to make us overlook all the possibilities contained in the repeated declarations of the inspired Word that we are 'the people of God'. Much is to be learned from this proclamation by God's messengers and there is a certain narrowness of treatment of the doctrine of the Church which is not an uncommon danger even for the theologian; his concept of the Church imperceptibly becomes too mystical and too internal. This narrowness is precisely corrected if we associate considerations concerning the 'people of God' with the dogmas of the Church of Christ." Elsewhere he quotes the description given in Ecclesiasticus xxxviii, 25-27: "The wisdom of a scribe cometh by his time of leisure: and he that is less in action shall receive wisdom. With what wisdom shall he be furnished that holdeth the plough and that glorieth in the goad, that driveth the oxen therewith, and is occupied

in their labours : and his whole talk is about the offspring of bulls ? He shall give his mind to turn up furrows : and his care is to give the kine fodder." The inclusion by the writer of Ecclesiasticus of the peasant and the craftsman *as such* in the Divine Society and as participators in the Divine Wisdom might be regarded as summing up the teaching of the medieval poet who identified the Head of the Church with plowmen and other manual labourers. On this passage from Ecclesiasticus Abbot Vonier commented: "If Catholic spirituality at any time were devoid of sympathy for the burdens of the life of the poor, it would stand self-condemned as an illusion, as a pride of the spirit. Even in its highest aspect Catholic spirituality is in immediate contact with the simplicities, the domesticities, not to say the vulgarities, of the human crowds, because the crowds are God's dear creatures ; He has given them that condition of life, He endows them with graces and instincts and perceptions that enable them to fulfil their destiny." Langland said much the same thing when, in Mr. Christopher Dawson's words, "he saw Christ walking in English fields in the dress of an English labourer", and translated his vision into the poem we know as *Piers Plowman*.

In selecting as the representative of the Catholic laity a manual labourer, Langland proclaims his belief in the sanctity of work. It is the worker *as such* who is his hero. Chaucer's folk are in holiday attire, but the central figure in the *Vision* goes in rough home-spun :

"For our joy and our health Jesus Christ of Heaven  
In a poor man's apparel followeth us ever."

Piers, too, goes on pilgrimage, but his manner of doing so is other than that of the pilgrims bound for Canterbury.

"I shall put on," said Perkin, "a pilgrim's garment,  
And I shall go with you till we find Truth.  
I shall put on my apparel that is patched and ragged,  
My leggings, and my cuffs against cold in my fingers ;  
Hang my hopper at my neck instead of a wallet,  
And I shall bring a bushel of bread corn in it."

Langland, however, does not make the mistake of the modern sentimentalist. The worker as a worker is not, for him, an object of pity. With an insistence as great as that of Carlyle, he preaches the dignity of labour. No writer has taught more clearly or forcibly the nobility of the man who does faithfully the task allotted him, no one has more consistently associated sanctity with the true performance of humble duties.

In the following quotation we shall see that the poet relates honest work, of whatsoever kind it be, to what theologians term "the grace of the Head". Such grace, he implies, is required even for our everyday duties. It is also clear from these lines that if he gives special prominence to the manual labourer, it is no exclusive honour he accords to this type ; his ideal society is far removed from the conception of a community consisting of a single class. And as his ideal commonwealth is hierarchical in structure, so are the several kinds of workers bound to each other and to the Head in loyalty and love. Each member of this functional body works in co-operation with the rest. The passage might be taken as a summary of Langland's social idealism. Speaking of Grace, whom he personifies, he says :

"To some he gave wit and power of speech  
Wherewith to win livelihood as the world demands,  
As preachers and priests and followers of the Law,  
That they might live honestly by labour of their tongues,  
Enlightening others as Grace might direct.  
And some he taught craft and how to know by sight  
Vol. xvi. P

In selling and buying their belief to win,  
 And some he taught to labour, living honestly and truly  
 And some he taught to till, to ditch and to thresh,  
 By means of his teaching their livelihood to gain,  
 And some to assess, figures to understand. . . .  
 And all he taught loyally that each craft might love others  
 And forbade altogether quarrels among them,  
 'Though some have more honour,' quoth Grace, see ye  
 well

That the higher kind of craftsman had I so chosen,  
 I could have assigned, since grace lies in my gift,  
 To the work that is lowly and poorly esteemed.  
 Look that none avoid other but as brethren love all.  
 And those that most mysteries know should be mild  
 in bearing."

That, I venture to think, is not only a faithful reproduction in fourteenth-century terms of the idea expressed in the passage quoted from Ecclesiasticus, but it bears a close resemblance to the social and industrial idealism outlined in recent Encyclicals. Here, all those centuries ago, was given to the world by a Catholic-minded poet the principles embodied in Catholic Action. The underlying idea, as will be seen, is that of the Mystical Body. Beneath the threefold divisions according to which Piers represents (1) the historical Jesus, (2) the priesthood, (3) the working laity, is what Father Mersch calls "the Whole Christ". It is He who binds all together in a mystical unity which extends from the altar to the husbandman behind his plow.

It is sometimes questioned whether a doctrine so recondite as that of the Mystical Body can be presented in a fashion sufficiently popular to make it comprehensible by the faithful generally. It might be a sufficient reply to that inquiry to point out that, though St. Paul characterized those he was addressing as "not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble", he did not

hesitate to expound this doctrine to them. But in *The Vision of Piers Plowman* we are given an answer even more relevant to our problem inasmuch as the poem was written for an English public. Piers Plowman, according to Jusserand, became a popular pass-word, bandied about among the commons as embodying their ideals. It really did reach the class about which and for which it was written. And we may perhaps accept the word of Earl Baldwin when he declares that the Englishman for whom Langland wrote has not changed. "How much the less man you, if you do not know *Piers Plowman*?" declared that authority. "For therein is to be found the key to the Englishman of today, with the same strength and weakness, the same humour immutable."

Langland has indicated a method by which the mystery of the Mystical Body can be, at least to some degree, conveyed to the illiterate and uninstructed. It is not the way of the theologian, the professional teacher. It is a method which avoids the metaphysical problems involved and appeals in homely language and by means of familiar scenes directly to the imagination, the sense of humour and the piety of the people. Wherefore it might be well, if in our petitions to heaven, this notice were to appear:  
Wanted: A twentieth-century William Langland.

STANLEY B. JAMES.

## HOMILETICS

### *Palm Sunday*

**D**URING this week of sorrow, Mother Church invites us to come to Calvary, to take our place beside Mary the sinless and Mary the sinner, to gaze on the Divine Victim laid on the altar of the Cross. As we fix our eyes on His Sacred Face some details claim our attention. We see His hair ; long wavy locks once beautiful, beautiful when He was a child, when Mary caressed them ; now unsightly, tossed and matted, matted with perspiration and with blood from the crown of thorns. We look into His eyes ; there is a certain majesty there, a certain dignity, a certain strength, the strength of one who lays down his life of his own will. With majesty and strength there are mercy and tenderness and compassion in these eyes, in these eyes that glanced forgiveness to Peter and pardon to Mary Magdalen. But there is also in these eyes a look of loneliness and sorrow, the loneliness of one who has been abandoned by His friends, the sorrow of one who knows that for so many whom He loves what He suffers now will be in vain.

As we hold that picture of Christ on the Cross a familiar description comes back to us. *There is no beauty in Him nor comeliness.* Only too true ; He has none of the grace or comeliness that would make us gaze on Him, none of the beauty that would make us desire Him. We see Him instead as one to be despised, as the most abject of men, a man of sorrows, a man acquainted with suffering, one from whom men would turn away their eyes. One might think that this description was penned by an eye-witness, by someone like John who stood beneath the Cross ; we know, however, that it was written centuries before by Isaias. And the same prophet-evangelist of the Passion has told us why Christ suffered. *He hath borne our infirmities and carried our sorrows.* Yes, this Servant of God, whom we see as one chastized and stricken by God and afflicted, is wounded for our iniquities and bruised for our sins ; on Him is laid the suffering which purchases our peace, by His stripes we are made whole. For we all were wandering like sheep without a shepherd, each one seeking his own

path, and the Lord made all our sin bear down on Him. Full freely He makes Himself a victim ; no word passes His lips. As a sheep led to the slaughter, as a lamb standing before the shearer, He is dumb.

Still holding our picture, and remembering the holiness and sinlessness of the Victim, we recall another familiar phrase, *Behold the Lamb of God*. John the Baptist echoes Isaias. The Servant of God is the Lamb of God. Hanging on the Cross He has the spotless innocence of a lamb. He was all-holy, all-just. Because He was the Son of God He could not have sin, He could defy His enemies to prove Him guilty of sin. But now He who knew no sin has become sin for us. God has made Him to become sin. Himself God equal to the Father in all things, as God made man He is obedient to the Father. And since the Father so loved the world as to give His only-begotten Son, Christ is obedient even to the death on the Cross.

By the death on the Cross the Lamb of God takes away the sin of the world. We have been redeemed, says St. Peter, with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled. Only the Lamb of God could have redeemed us. Our sin, committed by Adam, was of infinite malice ; it called for satisfaction of infinite value. Divine justice required such satisfaction as only a Divine Person could offer. And Divine mercy gave us that Divine Person ; God so loved the world as to give His only-begotten Son.

During this week, therefore, let us remember the picture of Christ drawn by the prophet Isaias and the witness to Christ borne by the more than prophet John the Baptist. Let us remember that the Passion of Jesus Christ is not a mere drama, that we are not mere spectators. Let us try to realize that the Man of Sorrows carried our sorrows, that the Lamb of God took away our sin.

### *Easter Sunday*

Today's sermon may well take the form of an explanation of the *Victimæ Paschali* which contains so much of the Easter message. The ever-increasing number of the

faithful who use a Missal will doubtless welcome a simple commentary on the Sequence read each morning during Easter week.

*Victimæ paschali laudes immolent Christiani.* The opening strophe echoes the teaching of the Apocalypse that the Lamb which was slain is worthy to receive honour and glory and benediction. All Christians should offer their sacrifice of praise to the Paschal Victim, Christ our Pasch, Who as the Lamb of God has redeemed His sheep. Of that redemption an immediate effect is reconciliation. The sinless Christ has reconciled sinners to the Father. True God and true man, Christ was the perfect Mediator: He had something in common with each of the estranged parties; He had Divine Nature in common with God, He had human nature in common with man. In Him God and man met; through Him God and man were reconciled. And we who were children of wrath are now children of God.

*Mors et vita duello conflixere mirando.* By God's permission there was an hour for the powers of darkness; it was God's will that Christ should die. But Christ's death was a death once and for all, and thus death no longer has lordship over Him. He now has the lordship, since by His death He conquered death. The Easter dawn saw the issue of that wondrous conflict between Life and Death; it saw Christ arise in triumph. And in that triumph all we who have been grafted into Christ must have a share. Our baptism which symbolizes a death like His, bears promise of a resurrection like His. Even our frail human body doomed to dust will share in Christ's victory; this corruptible body will cease to be corruptible, this mortal body will cease to be mortal. Since Christ is the first-fruits of them that sleep, all who are one with Christ must be the remainder of the harvest. The resurrection of the dead is as certain as the Resurrection of Christ.

*Dic nobis, Maria, quid vidisti in via?* To the Mass of St. Mary Magdalen the Church has assigned a *Credo*, a liturgical privilege not granted to saints unless they be apostles or doctors. It is surely fitting to extend the privilege to one who can be called an apostle, indeed, an apostle to the Apostles, sent to announce to them the joyful tidings of the Resurrection. Her mission was urgent; she must



to embrace the feet of her Risen Master Whose unforgettable "Mary" had overwhelmed her soul with joy ; an apostle in sacrifice, she must leave even Christ to be a witness to His brethren. There were other witnesses ; the empty tomb, the linen cloths, and apart in a place by itself the rolled-up napkin. Angel-witnesses, too, to speak His epitaph ; no *Hic jacet* but *Non est hic : surrexit*. Yes, Christ had risen ; Mary Magdalen could proclaim it and call Him her hope and the hope of sinful humanity. And the brethren were to see Him, that day of course in Jerusalem, and later in Galilee whither the Shepherd was to go before them in fidelity to the promise He had made them in the upper-room. And there on the mountain He had appointed He was to give them the commission to teach all nations.

*Scimus Christum surrexisse*. From the teaching of the Apostles we know with the certainty of our faith that Christ has risen, and on this day which the Lord has made we rejoice and are glad. We now have the unassailable proof to strengthen our faith ; we have the victory of the risen life to confirm our hope ; let us pray for the mercy and grace which will increase our charity. *Tu autem, victor Rex, miserere, Amen. Alleluia.*

### *Low Sunday*

Today's Gospel describes two appearances of the Risen Christ to His Apostles. There were many such appearances, but the main point and purpose of them all seems to be well summed up by St. Luke when he tells us (Acts i, 3) that to the Apostles whom He had chosen "He showed Himself alive after His Passion by many proofs, during forty days appearing to them and speaking of the kingdom of God." Here we see the two-fold purpose, to confirm their faith and to instruct them for their future work in the Church. Pentecost of course was to come, but meanwhile Christ had much to impart with human tongue to those whom He had chosen as apostles and priests.

The Apostles were newly ordained priests. They had true vocations ; our Divine Lord had called them. Men of different age and character, of different intellectual power

and equipment, they had been called from different occupations ; one had been called from his tax-collector's booth, others from their boats and their nets. They had all studied for the priesthood, they had read their course of Theology in the school of Jesus Christ. Their course was a very practical course. They had seen their Master performing before their eyes the duties of a priest ; they had seen Him give His blessing, they had seen Him visit the sick, they had heard Him preach, they had seen Him forgive sin, they had seen Him saying Mass. And they knew that they had been chosen and ordained to continue His work, to give the world life and to give it in abundance.

They were full of zeal, these newly ordained priests ; all save the traitor would have echoed Peter's protestation of readiness to follow the Master both into prison and to death. They were full of love ; their hearts were troubled at the thought that He was leaving them ; they would have taken the sword, one of them did, to prevent it. It is clear, however, that their zeal and love lacked the firm faith and the true knowledge without which apostle or priest cannot succeed. Although they had been so long a time with Him, they did not know Him. They still had many things to learn which they could not yet bear. Least of all could they bear the truth that their Master must suffer so as to enter into His glory.

A short hour after their Ordination their weakness was made manifest. It needed the Resurrection to strengthen them. And the fact had first to be made certain before its implications could penetrate their weak minds. Not for them the evidence which they discounted as the idle tales of women : John needed the empty tomb, Peter needed an appearance, Thomas required to see in His hands the print of the nails and to put his hand into the pierced side. No mistake was possible when they saw the flesh and bones that no spirit could have, and saw Him eat the food which only a living body could eat. They could no longer doubt, they could no longer hesitate : the Master was alive, He was risen, He was God.

Steadfast in faith now, they found it easy to understand what the Master was to impart in these last precious conversations. Old Testament prophecies could be no longer

obscure  
their full  
they felt  
them the  
about H  
His Chu  
the Psal  
how the  
them th  
which w  
and un  
no influ  
that th  
Roman  
have to  
knew t  
suffer r  
Who h  
and str  
forth to

WH  
of our  
spoke  
not su  
rection  
to all  
wome  
shoul  
We sh  
God's  
minist  
down  
W  
angel  
not se  
our  
Or is

occu- obscure when explained by a teacher Who was Himself  
 booth, their fulfilment. Like the Disciples on the road to Emmaus,  
 had all they felt their hearts burning within them as He opened to  
 course of them the Scriptures and explained what had been written  
 course about His Passion and His Resurrection and the glory of  
 Master His Church in the Law of Moses and in the Prophets and in  
 ; they the Psalms. Eagerly they drank in His instructions as to  
 im visit how they should rule and govern the faithful and give to  
 en Him them the teaching which was His Light and the sacraments  
 and they which were His Life. They knew that they were weak men  
 continue and unlettered, that they had no money, no patronage,  
 ndance no influence, no organization, no propaganda ; they knew  
 priests that they would have the world of Greek thought and  
 estation Roman power against them ; they knew that they would  
 and to have to face the bitter hostility of Jewish prejudice ; they  
 rouble knew that they would be persecuted and would have to  
 would suffer many things. But they knew too that Jesus Christ,  
 t. It is Who had conquered death itself, would be ever with them,  
 ne firm and strong in the knowledge that He was God they went  
 stle on forth to conquer the world.

### *Second Sunday after Easter*

When we recall that an angel announced the Conception  
 of our Divine Lord to His Virgin Mother, and that an angel  
 spoke to the shepherds the glad tidings of His Birth, we are  
 not surprised to find angels bearing witness to His Resur-  
 rection. An angel-hand rolled back the stone to reveal  
 to all the empty tomb ; an angel-voice assured the holy  
 women that Christ had risen. These messengers of God  
 should not be forgotten by us during this Easter season.  
 We shall do well to turn our thoughts to that noblest part of  
 God's creation and to contemplate that heavenly host of  
 ministering spirits who stand before God's Face and bow  
 down in adoration before His throne.

Why is it that we find it difficult to think about the  
 angels ? When last did we think about them ? Does it  
 not seem true that we almost ignore their existence ? Even  
 our Guardian Angels, are they often in our thoughts ?  
 Or is the cynical saying true, that the wings with which our

imperfect imagining clothed them have borne them out of our life ?

There was a time when we had a far more vivid realization of their existence and their presence. We knew them when we were children. At our mother's knee we learned of the angel who brought the message to Mary and of the choir of angels who sang to the shepherds ; there too we were taught to pray to our Guardian Angel, to seek his protection "ever this day" and "ever this night". Later on we learned more about the angels. We learned of the great battle in heaven in which the good angels led by Michael vanquished those who rebelled under Lucifer. Michael was one of the heroes of our childhood : we wondered if he was the angel whom God sent to destroy the enemies of the chosen people ; we certainly thought that he would have been in command of the twelve legions of angels whom Our Lord might have had in the garden if He had asked His Father. And as we knew Michael, so we knew Gabriel the announcer and Raphael the healer and others for whom we had no names. When we asked questions about all these angels we were told that they were spirits, that they had no bodies ; that they were eminently pure and holy, that ever since their time of probation all the good angels who fought with Michael could no longer sin. We were told also that the angels were far more intelligent than human beings, that they did not have to learn, that they did not have to reason, that they saw things in a flash. And we were told that their number could not be counted, that there were millions of them serving God and employed by God to spend their heaven in doing good upon earth. Ever so clearly we saw them, on Jacob's ladder, climbing up to offer our prayers to God, coming down to give God's mercies to mankind.

That was our childhood impression of the holy angels. And it was not a fairy-tale, it was not a story for the nursery, it was the true Catholic doctrine which now we have almost forgotten. Of course, if we are questioned, we profess our faith in angels and accept without hesitation what the Church teaches about them, but in all honesty we must admit that they have but little place in our thoughts and little influence on our daily lives. Our faith in their

existence is  
not vivid, o  
It seems  
little child  
around us  
that degree  
far above t  
by loving  
presence a  
to guide u  
as to Para

Today  
Peter on  
example,  
his teachi  
read elsew  
the heart  
a comma  
The teach  
Peter wa  
hand on  
Christ ha  
To P  
which sh  
them :  
often ou  
had pro  
"Yea, th  
With co  
against  
now sud  
courtyar  
exagger  
the wat  
so near  
one to  
he had

existence is not lively, our appreciation of their dignity is not vivid, our sense of their presence is scarcely real.

It seems very necessary that we should become again as little children and recover the heaven of angels that lay around us in our infancy. If we cannot attain at once to that degree of devotion which venerates the angels as beings far above us in the scale of perfection, we can at least begin by loving them as our guardians. Let us reverence their presence and supplicate their protection, beseeching them to guide us on our path through life and at the end to lead us to Paradise.

### *Third Sunday after Easter*

Today's Epistle contains the moral teaching of St. Peter on such practical matters as purity of thought, good example, and obedience to civil authority. As we examine his teaching, we find it very familiar : we remember having read elsewhere a condemnation of adultery committed in the heart, an exhortation to let our light shine before men, a command to render to Caesar what is due to Caesar. The teaching of Peter is of course the teaching of Christ : Peter was an apostle, sent to continue Christ's work, to stand on Christ's teaching, to teach all men to observe what Christ had commanded.

To Peter the Apostle we scarcely do justice. The faults which should set off his virtues seem rather to overshadow them : "the dram of eale doth all the noble substance often out". The denial of course makes sad reading. He had protested his loyalty in such vehement language : "Yea, though I should die with thee, I will not deny thee." With courage, if not with wisdom, he had drawn the sword against Malchus. He had even followed the arrest. And now suddenly he cowers before a little servant-maid in the courtyard. Other things we remember too, and perhaps exaggerate against him. He lost heart when walking on the water, even though the Master's welcoming hand was so near. He slept in the garden when the Master wanted one to watch with Him. Even in his greatest hour, when he had made his wonderful profession of faith and earned

the promise of the Primacy, he earned also a rebuke : "Get behind me, Satan ; thou art a stumbling-block to me for thou heedest not the things of God but the things of men." And we remember too that he looked for his reward : "Behold we have left all things and have followed thee ; what therefore shall we have ?" St. Jerome writes playfully as St. Jerome could : "Who ever heard the like ? Peter was only a fisherman ; he had no money ; he had to work for his daily bread. And he had the assurance to say that he had left all things !"

St. Jerome, however, hastens to defend him : after all, Peter had done the all-important thing ; he had followed Christ. We too must hasten to defend him from our own exaggerated charges. To Peter much can be forgiven because he loved much. His was a repentance of love. The incomparable *Flevit amare* of the Gospel prepares us for the tradition of the tear-furrows on those rugged cheeks. His love indeed is manifest even when he seems to fail. It was love urged him to walk on the water ; it was love made him expostulate with the Master Who had spoken of the Passion ; it was love made him follow, even if afar off, when the others fled ; it was love brought him into the courtyard. One feels that Peter yielded nothing in love even to John, that only Peter could have so replied when the Risen Master "said to him the third time : Simon, son of John, lovest thou me ? And he said to him : Lord, thou knowest all things ; thou knowest that I love thee."

What shall we say of Peter's faith ? We see it gaining strength from the first day when the Master called him to be a fisher of men ; we see it find expression in the unforgettable "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." We remember that his was the faith that Christ prayed for, the faith that would not fail, the faith with which he was to confirm the brethren. With faith came courage. It needed courage to draw the sword in the garden against a band of soldiers and the great multitude with swords and clubs. It had needed courage to face the billows whose strength the fisherman knew. But greatest and most perfect was his courage when nature had been made perfect by grace. The Apostle we know after Pentecost had the courage to tell the Sanhedrin that he would obey God rather than

man. The new Peter had the courage to charge the Jews with deicide : "Ye denied the holy and just one, and asked for a murderer to be granted you, but the author of life ye killed." And the Peter who had cowered before a servant-maid in the courtyard had the courage to face Rome, the mistress of the world. He knew that it meant death in the end ; the Master had foretold it. But Peter had love, and faith, and courage.

BERNARD PATTEN.

## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

**W**E live in an age when, perhaps more than ever, the purpose of life is being questioned by young and old alike ; when a desire for "self-realization", for "living one's life to the full" is rife, and this fullness of life, this happiness for which humanity so craves, is sought just where it cannot be found. This misdirection of man's striving affects not only those outside the Church, but even those within the fold. The tragedy indeed is, as Fr. Leen<sup>1</sup> points out, that "souls entering at birth into the full light of revelation, should suffer, in large measure, from the same blindness as those so much less favoured than themselves. . . . They, with the unerring word of God to instruct them, should know what human happiness consists and how it is to be gained. But how many of them . . . are tormented in the depths of their soul with the uneasy feeling that they are not getting the best or the most out of their lives ! . . . Even deeply religious souls find themselves faced with the difficulty of making their hourly activities yield them up the sense of growth in real life and of the happiness that should spring from such a growth. . . . They have no difficulty in solving for themselves, by the light of their faith, questions of right and wrong. They can find God in formal prayer but yet they seem unable to handle their life in such a way as to secure by such handling the progressive satisfaction of the deep yearnings of the human heart and soul" (p. 24). Catholics do not allow their faith to influence many of the ordinary issues of social, political, economic and aesthetic life. This tormenting dissatisfaction of man can be overcome only by a thorough understanding of Christianity by living Christ's teaching in its entirety. Man must believe in Christ wholly, and in studying Him must not emphasize His merciful traits to the exclusion of the stern ones. Mankind must remember that "the mission of Jesus was not a purely humanitarian one". His chief concern was the spiritual transformation of mankind. To reject the

<sup>1</sup> *Why the Cross ?* By Rev. Edward Leen, C.S.Sp. Pp. 366. (London: Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.)



is to reject Christ who comes to us with the power and the will to lead us to happiness—a happiness that consists in the vision of God, face to face hereafter, and by faith now. Christ has won this possibility for us by His death on the Cross; and paradoxical though it may appear, the Cross is the key to happiness, for it is only by the Cross that the soul's purification and divine assimilation can be fully achieved.

Fr. Leen goes back to the very beginning of God's purpose in creating man, and shows how human nature fell in the fall of its first parent Adam. But each person is restored in Christ by his mystical incorporation in Christ. Human nature, however, still finds it difficult to tend towards its true happiness, towards God. Christ in His life and teaching shows us that we can be truly happy only in the measure in which we share God's happiness; and this necessitates the constant struggle against the three concupiscences. But Christ's teaching is not a "mere negative" one of detachment from creatures. The process of detachment from creatures is a process of attachment to God". Christ, the true Light, illumines man's path to happiness, bringing clearly into relief that man's urge to fullness of life and greatness is not in what man has, but in what he becomes, in his growth of soul. This search for union with God is truly a knightly quest, and the story of the Shepherds at Bethlehem indicates the signs by which we shall discover Him. "The road to Him will always be through darkness, dimly illuminated by the fitful light of faith" (p. 31). "The shepherds were beside themselves with joy because they had discovered what all men seek. They had not allowed the darkness of the Cave to dim the brightness nor its coldness chill the warmth of their faith. . . . Their experience is instructive for all those who receive the call to quit the routine practice of religion and to enter into relations of close intimacy with God. Such persons, untrained in the ways of the interior life, are wont to weave out of their own imaginations a picture of the conditions in which the Saviour is to be found. This picture, as a rule, bears little resemblance to the Cave on the hillside. They expect to find God in a life that is to run a calm, even course, a life in which there are to be found no rude obstacles, no rough experiences. Suffering, of course, there must be, but

suffering in self-chosen conditions of dramatic effect. They expect to find the Prince of Peace in the midst of a court, where flourish refinement, courtesy and graceful charity. When the aspirant after God's intimacy encounters, instead of what was fondly imagined, much that is disagreeable to sense, hurtful to fine feelings and wounding to the quivering nerves of the soul—when the harsh, the unfeeling, the obtuse and the coarse make themselves painfully felt, there is the temptation to believe that this cannot be a setting for God" (pp. 233-4).

Suffering owing to the Fall is a necessary condition of man's earthly existence, but that does not mean unhappiness. Our Saviour while on earth, though He suffered as no mere man could suffer, was nevertheless happy, and His life shows that happiness is not incompatible with suffering; this His happiness He wishes to share with us, and it is precisely the joyousness and the happiness of His life that we are asked to share. This thought is worked out very beautifully in chapter five.

This suffices to show the absorbing theme of which the book treats. The doctrine is deep and sound, but the reader is aided to grasp it by the use that is made of italics to emphasize the different steps in the development of each chapter, and by the short summary at the end of each chapter. This is a challenging and stimulating book; one to read carefully and ponder over; it will be very helpful and enlightening to all who seek for greater intensity of life for all who want God.

One particular form which the Cross takes is that of sickness; and while it is so easy to speak of patience and resignation when one is in good health, it is quite another matter when sickness comes. Invalids have their own special trials, and their particular need of help in the sanctification of their sickness. In a book dedicated "*A mes frères et sœurs, les malades*,"<sup>1</sup> Myriam de G. has written forty-six short considerations for sick people. Herself an invalid for more than twenty-two years, she is able to speak to her fellow-sufferers from personal experience of their spiritual difficulties and needs. These pages should bring light

<sup>1</sup> *Larmes et Sourires*. Par Myriam de G. Pp. 242, with 12 illustrations (Paris: Editions Casterman.)

encouragement and strength to those for whom they are written.

*You Shall Find Rest*,<sup>1</sup> by Fr. J. Kearney, C.S. Sp., is a sequel to a former work of his which was noted in this review—Vol. xiv, p. 245. The present book is divided into two parts, *Our Surrender to God*, and *Surrender and Love*. In them the author selects for meditation “those manifestations which lead most naturally to confidence and love, namely the acts and words of Our Saviour which show forth the mercy of God and His Charity for men”. They are founded on the Gospels and give in simple language the teaching of Jesus on spiritual childhood and confidence; they portray Him as manifesting God’s Mercy and revealing Himself in the pardon of St. Peter. Especially attractive is the meditation on the Blessed Sacrament in which we are given the different appeals which Jesus makes to us in that sacrament; the appeal of His Childhood, of His Hidden Life, of a Personal Interview and so forth. The book should make a wide appeal, particularly to those whose spiritual life tends towards greater simplicity. It will be useful for spiritual reading as well as for mental prayer.

Disciples of St. Theresa of Lisieux will remember the saint’s devotion to the Holy Face of Our Lord, a devotion to which she was initiated by her sister, Mère Agnès de Jésus. The Carmel of Lisieux owed this devotion to Sister Marie de St. Pierre of the Carmel of Tours, whose life has recently appeared in English.<sup>2</sup> Sister Marie died in 1848 in the Carmel of Tours at the early age of thirty-two, after a life that was remarkable for its childlike simplicity, and for the revelations which she received from God, revelations concerned with devotion to the Holy Face as a means of preparation for Blasphemy. These revelations made to this humble sister have resulted in a world-wide devotion, and in the Confraternity of Reparation for Blasphemy and the profanation of the Sunday.

We turn from this Carmelite nun whose life was passed in the seclusion of the cloister, to a maiden who was called by God to play her part in the limelight of Europe. The

<sup>1</sup> Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 1 pp. xiv + 325. 6s.

<sup>2</sup> *Sister Marie de St. Pierre*. By Sister M. Emmanuel, O.S.B. 1 pp. x + 325. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 5s.)

Vol. xvi.

figure of St. Joan of Arc does not cease to call forth admiration, love and devotion. In a recent work<sup>1</sup> General S. Visconti-Prasca has endeavoured to make the saint better known in Italy. The book has been translated into French, and has been tastefully produced by Beauchesne. In a preface General Weygand points out that the writer, while neglecting none of the works on his subject, has made use of Italian sources, which have hitherto been somewhat overlooked in French writings on the saint. The fact that there were Italian captains and soldiers among St. Joan's troops, and Italian ambassadors and historians of note in France, accounts for the presence of valuable documents in the State archives. The author suggests an interesting train of thought when he says : "If the strip of territory still belonging to the French King in 1420 had been taken, the English would have been installed on the banks of the Mediterranean from the fifteenth century, to the eve of the Protestant Reformation, and the history of Europe would probably have followed a different course. In starting that movement which drove the English beyond the Channel, Joan of Arc rendered an incomparable service to Latin and Mediterranean civilization." The book is beautifully written, and will be welcomed by those who love this saint. The author sums up Joan in these words : "*Jeanne d'Arc, à la lumière des archives, apparaît comme une figure essentiellement latine par sa claire intelligence et son énergie agissante, unie à la beauté, à la générosité et à la courtoisie. Elle représente l'idéal qui a voulu et su se servir de la force pour accroître son triomphe par la voie de la lutte et du sacrifice. Cette fusion de la pensée et de l'action fut, en tout temps, l'essence du génie et la raison de toute grandeur.*"

Fr. R. H. J. Steuart, S.J., has already established his position as a spiritual writer ; and those who are acquainted with his previous works will welcome his recent book, *In Divers Manners*,<sup>2</sup> a series of intellectual considerations on various points of Christ's doctrine and spiritual interest.

LAURENCE P. EMERY.

<sup>1</sup> *Jeanne d'Arc*. Par Général S. Visconti-Prasca, traduit de l'Italien par Jean Godfrin. Pp. 234, with 10 illustrations and 4 maps. (Paris: Beauchesne et Fils.)

<sup>2</sup> *In Divers Manners*. By R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. Pp. 158. (Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 5s.

## II. HISTORY

*The Gateway to the Middle Ages* by Eleanor Shipley Duckett<sup>1</sup> is one of those rare books which have obviously been a delight to their author to produce. It is a survey of the life and literature of the sixth century constructed almost entirely on contemporary sources, and its candid charm conceals a wealth of learning. It was the age of the Gothic settlements, when the great Theodoric won for himself the throne of the Western Caesars, an age which saw the brilliant resurgence of Justinian and the subsequent failure of the Imperial power, its unavailing attempt to bring Italy back within the compass of the Eastern Empire, and then, in Western Europe, the magnificent work of Pope Gregory the Great. It was an age of foundations, which were laid and have persisted, as the names of Cassiodorus, Boethius, Caesarius of Arles, Randegund, Fortunatus, ColumCille, Columban and Benedict of Nursia bear witness. Miss Duckett very pertinently quotes a sentence from Professor W. P. Ker in her introduction: "Almost anything that is common to the Middle Ages, and much that lasts beyond the Renaissance, is to be found in the authors of the sixth century." The Rule of St. Benedict, and the twin marvels of St. Fortunatus, the *Vexilla Regis* and the *Pange Lingua*, are among the best-known of these writings which have come down to our own day. Miss Duckett's book is expressly intended for the general reader, and contains very little critical discussion. The chapter entitled "A Picture of Britain" is largely an adaptation of "the uncouth jeremiad" of Gildas, with no great value for the historian. Problems like the Saxon Shore or the evidence for the Saxon conversions based on the "flight from cremation" are completely disregarded. But this is a pleasant book to read, making ample use of Catholic authorities, and helping to bring to life again the atmosphere, the learning and the spirit of the sixth century.

Of totally different stamp is Mr. Wade-Evans's edition of Nennius's "*History of the Britons*,"<sup>2</sup> an excellent example of

<sup>1</sup> Demy 8vo. Pp. xii + 620. (Macmillan and Co. 21s.)

<sup>2</sup> Demy 8vo. Pp. 156. (S.P.C.K. Published for the Church Historical Society. 7s. 6d.)

careful and competent editing. The *Historia Brittonum* is the work of a Welsh priest of the late eighth century, of little value as a source for reliable history, but containing the origin or the expansion of many of the legends of Saxon history, such as the hopelessly confused story of Vortigern, the earliest account of King Arthur, and the battle of Mount Badon. The editor has added translations of three other documents, notably "The Story of the Loss of Britain", which, although of low historical value, is important as a source of Nennius's own work, and of Bede's Ecclesiastical History.

Pope Gregory the Great reappears in the opening chapter of the fifth volume of Fliche and Martin's *Histoire de l'Eglise*, a masterly survey of the Western policy of the Pope from the pen of M. René Aigrain, professor in the Faculté Catholique at Angers. Here are all the qualities of fine writing, accurate knowledge and exact documentation which we have come to expect from this remarkable history of the Church, which is gathering into collaboration some of the best scholars in France. The greater part of the present volume is taken up with the story of the Eastern Empire, with the struggles of the Emperor Heraclius and his line to resist the Persian and the Arab menace, his attempts to obtain religious peace at home, and the condemnation of the Monothelite heresy. These chapters are the work of M. Louis Bréhier, one of the greatest living authorities on Byzantine history, the progress of Western Christendom being capably dealt with by M. Aigrain, whose chapter on Christian England and the Celtic Churches adds nothing new. The planning of the book is open to criticism, and the parallel movement of events in East and West is difficult to follow. Even a chronological chart would have been a great help in overcoming this difficulty.

Another outstanding book is Mr. Z. N. Brooke's contribution to Messrs. Methuen's *History of Medieval and Modern Europe*<sup>2</sup>. The book covers three important centuries, the period of recovery from the darkness of the ninth century,

<sup>1</sup> *Grégoire le Grand, les Etats barbares et la conquête arabe* (590-751). By Louis Bréhier and René Aigrain. Demy 8vo. Pp. 576. (Bloud et Gay. 75 frs.)

<sup>2</sup> *A History of Europe, 911-1198*. Demy 8vo. Pp. xx + 553 with one map. (Methuen. 16s.)

of consolidation and revival, closing on the eve of the great pontificate of Innocent III. It is a period which opens in gloom and closes in tension, but it was in these three centuries that civilization in Europe made its most substantial progress, while in the tenth century foundations even more important and lasting than those of the sixth were laid. The menace of the Vikings died, the Norsemen settled, in Germany the Saxon kings began to establish a precarious control over the welter that succeeded the break-up of the Carolingian Empire, in France the Capetian power began to consolidate round Paris, and, perhaps most important of all, in 910 the monastery of Cluny was founded. Mr. Brooke traces with great lucidity and in clear, vigorous prose the movements of this revival, in the growth of the Saxon monarchy—throughout the book his treatment of German history is outstandingly good—in the ecclesiastical revival whose greatest expression was the centralized Papacy growing in power from Gregory VII to Innocent III, and in the recovery of civilization in literature, art and architecture. Outstanding in the Church's story is the revival which a false tradition associates too closely with the name of Cluny, the gigantic struggle of Empire and Papacy, arising, at first almost incidentally, from Gregory VII's determination to rid the Church of the blighting incubus of lay control, and the great monastic renewal with the outstanding personality of St. Bernard. Mr. Brooke understands the spirit of these times, sympathizes with its ideals and appreciates its achievements. He has written a very good book, and one to be recommended.<sup>1</sup>

*An Outline of Church History*<sup>2</sup> consists of a series of twelve short chapters by different authors, very like the text of wireless talks, dealing with the history of the early Church. The tone is undogmatic and modernist, and for historical value the lay contributors far surpass their reverend colleagues. Mr. Cyril Bailey and Professor E. F. Jacob wrestle manfully to portray the Roman background and the thought

<sup>1</sup> One might criticize minor points in the two very compressed chapters dealing with ecclesiastical life and learning, and the life of the laity. There are a few small slips in dating, and one unfortunate misprint (p. 121) which makes the author say that clerical celibacy was "proscribed" by the law of the Western Church. The context clearly indicates "prescribed".

<sup>2</sup> Edited by Caroline Duncan-Jones. Crown 8vo. Pp. 154. (George Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d.)

of St. Augustine in a few pages. On the other hand the treatment of St. Paul and the Messianic preaching is too poor for serious criticism. To summarize the early Christian teaching as "we preach Christ crucified" and sedulously to avoid all reference to the Resurrection, is modern, perhaps, but it is not history.

M. Paul Vignaux's little book<sup>1</sup> is scarcely more than an essay, written with an economy of language in an almost telegraphic style which at times obscures the author's meaning. But its pages are packed with some of the most suggestive considerations I have yet read on the processes of medieval thought. The author stresses less the different schools of thought than the different modes of thought, even within the same school, their ultimate theological preoccupation, and the influence of the mystical approach to God on philosophical thought. He is interested less by Thomism than by the reaction from Thomist thought associated with Duns Scotus, with Ockham and the nominalists. There is much in these pages which will provoke criticism from the philosophical expert, I have no doubt. For the historian I note merely one from among many compelling suggestions. The insistence on the divine, the problem of transcendent reality, led, by reaction, to an exaltation of nature, to a true "medieval humanism" bordering at times on Pelagianism, most notable in Scotus, according to the formula *dignificare naturam*. This humanism—from Abelard to Biel—is one of the underlying themes of M. Vignaux's essay. It is a strong optimistic stream totally opposed to the pessimism of Luther, and one is left wondering how far Luther's thought can be successfully linked up, as is now frequently suggested, with the nominalist advance in the fifteenth century. At the present rate of exchange this book costs something less than two shillings. For anyone willing to face a little hard reading it is ridiculously cheap.

Mr. Belloc's *Monarchy: A Study of Louis XIV*<sup>2</sup> is typical of its author, showing forth all his brilliant qualities and also a good many of his defects. It is exactly what the subtitle defines it to be—a study. The general scheme is

<sup>1</sup> *La Pensée au Moyen Age*. Crown 8vo. Pp. 206. (Collection Armand Colin, 103, Boulevard Saint-Michel, Paris. 15 frs.)

<sup>2</sup> Demy 8vo. Pp. xii + 392. (Cassell and Co. 12s. 6d.)



chronological, but Mr. Belloc allows himself the freedom to pick and choose his moments for discussion, for the laying down of principle, and for wider surveys. The moral of the book, as I see it, is that monarchy is made by the monarch, and that in the process the man, who is also king, may have to sacrifice much or all. The book follows the double theme of the triumph and splendour of the monarchy, and the effect of this power and triumph on the monarch's soul. The scope of the book gives Mr. Belloc full opportunity for the display of some of his best writing, with that clarity of thought, vividness of expression, apt comparison and provocative parenthesis of which he is such a master. He writes finely too of the great military achievements of the reign, with Rocroi and Condé at its beginning, and the great name of Marlborough at its close, and over all the genius of Vauban. There is a very good analysis of what Jansenism meant, but I am not so sure that the treatment of Gallicanism is quite satisfactory. I have said that the book shows some of Mr. Belloc's defects, and of these perhaps the most striking is his tendency to over-simplify complex movements and situations. Gallicanism is, I think, made too simple a thing, and in the same way the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes is made too much a function of the monarchical will for unity. It is none the less true that the first moves for revocation came from the higher clergy. Again, it may be true that "the political core of the whole story" is the natural conflict between Monarchy and the Money-power, and that the monarchy of Louis XIV was the "political guarantee of the governed", but the justification of this seems to me to mean too sweeping a simplification of the story of Fouquet and of the whole policy of Colbert; and to compare the monarchy of Louis XIV with the monarchies which are returning to the world today seems to be begging the question in more ways than one. I was reminded more than once while reading this book of the lines which Mr. Belloc once quoted to Dr. Coulton on the danger of half-truths in history :

Louis Quatorze

Went on all fours.

(But, to tell the truth,

Only in very early youth.)

A French author examines attentively an aspect of the Grand Monarque's policy which has hitherto been somewhat neglected: his attitude to the conquered provinces of Artois, Alsace, Flanders, Roussillon and Franche-Comté, which during his reign were brought within the boundaries of "la figure hexagonale de la France".<sup>1</sup> The author discusses, or in most cases leaves the facts to illustrate, the royal policy with regard to immigration, the fortification of frontiers, local privileges, the extension of royal justice and economic advantages. The chapter on *La Politique Religieuse* is valuable as showing that, in the newly acquired territory, the first objective was absorption, so that tolerance or repression depended on local conditions. In the Protestant districts of Alsace, for instance, Catholics and Lutherans were made to share the same church, the former in the choir, as they needed the altar, the latter in the nave. In the Spanish provinces the royal policy was steadfastly opposed to the Inquisition.

The fascination of the story of Mary Queen of Scots grows no less in the retelling, and interest is added to her latest biography in the fact that it is written by a woman who is also of French nationality.<sup>2</sup> This twofold qualification should be of great importance to anyone who attempts an interpretation of the character of the hapless queen. Mlle Henri-Bordeaux writes with fine distinction and a neat turn of phrase, with dramatic sense and sometimes biting irony. She sees the struggle in Scotland and the later plots in England as a battle royal between the forces of the Reformation and the old religion. If for her Mary never really rises to the stature of a heroine, save perhaps at the approach of death, her critical judgement and sound psychology enable her to make a satisfactory defence for the Queen against the accusations with which she is frequently charged. Mary's deception by both Darnley and Bothwell she attributes largely to the influence of the Guises in her early life. She grew up to trust chivalry, honour and brave display, and failed to read the ne'er-do-well and the

<sup>1</sup> *Louis XIV et les Provinces Conquises*. By Marquis de Roux. Large Crown 8vo. Pp. v + 321. (Les Editions de France, 20, Avenue Rapp. Paris, VII. 25 frs.)

<sup>2</sup> *Marie Stuart*. By Paule Henri-Bordeaux. Two volumes. Pp. 371 and 304. (Librairie Plon, Paris. 30 and 25 frs. respectively.)

ruffian adventurer beneath the surface. "Elle manque totalement de psychologie . . . et déchiffre mieux les manuscrits que les hommes." In some respects the judgement may be true, but it makes far too little of the imperious side of Mary's character. There are some minor inexactitudes in the work, those for instance concerning the early history of Gilbert Gifford; and occasional mis-translations, as when the point of Phelippes's remark, "we attend her very heart at the next" is missed. The story of the Casket Letters is well told, and with regard to Babington's plot the author follows Labanoff and Lingard in holding that Phelippes not only added the postscript to Mary's fateful letter, but also interpolated phrases in the body of the letter. She defends her case well, but the position adopted by the late Father Pollen, that the body of the letter is genuine, is, I think, more convincing. It is a pity that his *Mary Queen of Scots and the Babington Plot* does not appear in the otherwise extensive bibliography.

I have space for no more than a bare mention of two important books dealing with the question of toleration in the seventeenth century, the third volume of Dr. W. K. Jordan's monumental survey of *The Development of Religious Toleration in England*<sup>1</sup> and a new edition of the *Army Debates of 1647-9* from the Clarke Manuscripts under the title *Puritanism and Liberty*,<sup>2</sup> with a penetrating introduction by the editor, Mr. A. S. P. Woodhouse. I hope to be able to discuss both these works more fully at another time.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

### III. PHILOSOPHY

Text-books of the History of Philosophy are apt to be fields of very dry bones, but M. Gilson has shown us once again that he can make those dry bones live. If M. Gilson has ever written a dull book I have not come

<sup>1</sup> Demy 8vo. Pp. 560. (George Allen and Unwin. 21s.)

<sup>2</sup> Demy 8vo. Pp. 504. (J. M. Dent and Sons. 18s.)

across it ; but this newest contribution to his branch of philosophy<sup>1</sup> is at least as bright as any of his books that I have read and enjoyed.

His purpose here is to exhibit by an examination of several movements, which he styles "philosophical experiments", the true nature of philosophic knowledge. The book is in four parts which describe successively the mediaeval experiment, the cartesian experiment, the modern experiment and, finally, by way of an induction, the true nature and unity of philosophic experience.

In every one of these experiments we see the attempt to subject philosophy to the canons of some other discipline, and invariably the effort issues in scepticism. First of all, Abailard tries to solve the problem of the universals in virtue of the science with which he was most familiar, logic. But logic itself he approached by way of grammar. With supreme honesty he recognizes, after conquering various opponents, that there is no logical solution to his problem and he has to fall back on a psychological one ; and the result is scepticism.

The next phase of the mediaeval experiment shows the attempt to impose theology on philosophy. Moses Maimonides dealt with the Mussulman "theologists". The leader of the Christian attempt is St. Bonaventure. He is studied in the instance of grace and free will, where he concludes an argument by saying : "Even though that position were false, it would not harm piety or humility ; it is therefore fitting and safe to hold it." To which M. Gilson replies : "In theology, as in any other science, the main question is not to be pious, but to be right, for there is nothing pious in being wrong about God." Moving on to the question of philosophic knowledge, St. Bonaventure's theological bias led him to a conclusion which contained in germ the destruction of all natural knowledge, a destruction which became evident in the development of his doctrine undertaken by his disciples. Ockham paved the way to scepticism, and at last scholasticism was broken down and rational knowledge was abandoned by the moralists whose

<sup>1</sup> *The Unity of Philosophical Experience.* By Etienne Gilson. Pp. 340. (Sheed and Ward, 10s. 6d.)

logan was "Back to the Gospels", and by the mystics who enveloped not only Heaven but also Earth in a cloud of unknowing.

Realizing the fact of this breakdown but unaware of the root cause of it, Descartes set about the reconstruction of philosophy. Montaigne had doubted everything. Descartes would find a basis of certainty somewhere. But his attempt was vitiated from the start by his determination to apply to philosophy the method proper to mathematics. In a couple of brilliant and most readable chapters M. Gilson describes the grandiose cartesian experiment. Descartes' "angelism" swept Europe. His disciples learned to distrust scholasticism, and when Locke's criticism undermined the master's position they were once more ripe for scepticism. Cartesian mathematicism was resolved on the one hand into crude materialism, and on the other into Berkeleyan idealism. The intervention of Malebranche's occasionalism merely gave David Hume his opportunity to dismiss the principle of causality. Once again the wheel had come full circle.

As Montaigne's scepticism was the spur to Descartes, so Hume's pricked Kant to activity. Kant saw the error of mathematicism: "Though the *application* of mathematics be highly desirable wherever it is possible, the *imitation* of mathematics as a method of reasoning is very dangerous when tried in cases in which it is impossible to use it." And then he fell into a like mistake. "Physicism" is M. Gilson's name for this new phase of the recurrent error. In his struggle against the obvious fate of scepticism Kant seized the plank offered by Rousseau's moralism; hence the primacy of the practical reason. The way was open through Fichte to Hegel's dialecticism.

The last experiment is that of Auguste Comte, who tried to establish a universal philosophy on the principles of the newest science of sociology. He too had distinguished disciples, notably John Stuart Mill and Littré; but whereas Kant's disciples outstripped their master and were repudiated, Mill refused to subscribe to Comte's positivist politics and religion.

The breakdown of the modern experiment is associated with the emergence of Karl Marx, and his dependence on

Hegel through Feuerbach. Idealism had begotten dialectical materialism.

A rapid review of the modern philosophical sects leads M. Gilson to the statement: "Against the crude, yet fundamentally sound, craving of Marxism for positive and dogmatic truth the scepticism of our decadent philosophy has not a chance."

In a final recapitulatory section the author enumerates his conclusions from these various experiments. Philosophy will survive, but as man is a metaphysical animal it will have to be metaphysical. Metaphysics has not failed, but metaphysicians have, and that because of their unguarded use of a principle of unity present to the human mind. They have overlooked or misused the first principle of human knowledge, which is that the thing involved in all my representations is not thought but being.

Even those who may question the validity of M. Gilson's inference must allow that he has given a brilliant review of the history of philosophy and has presented many elements of the philosophic curriculum in a way that will prove invaluable to students.

Professor Gilson's account of the relations of Mill and Comte is corroborated by *A Hundred Years of British Philosophy*.<sup>1</sup> This great book is divided into two parts: I. The Older Schools of Thought—Nineteenth century, and II. Recent Schools of thought—End of nineteenth and Beginning of twentieth centuries.

In the first part we have an account of the Scottish School, the Utilitarian-Empirical School, the Evolutionary—Naturalist School and of Groups Interested in Religious Philosophy. There is nothing merely schematic about the arrangement of the material. In every case we are given an intimate and lively picture of the outstanding figures. For instance, occupying fifteen well-packed pages, there is a sympathetic, even glowing, account of Newman as a religious philosopher who "did more than anyone before him to reveal to the British world the glory and greatness of

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the German of Dr. Rudolf Metz by Professors J. W. Harvey, M.A., T. E. Jessop, M.A., and Henry Sturt, M.A. Edited for the Library of Philosophy by J. H. Muirhead, LL.D., F.B.A. Pp. 828. (George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 25s.)

this [Catholic] Church, its faith and its traditions, its dogmas and institutions, its inner as well as its outer life, so that men could feel the living breath of its spirit". That brief quotation from the record of one whose name is familiar to us all is given as a sample of the vigour and interest of the writing which characterizes the whole of this massive volume.

In the second part a long section of over two hundred pages is devoted to the Idealist movement. In this the outstanding personalities are those of Bradley and McTaggart, though the work of every other well-known philosopher of the school is carefully described. In this section the author's method of advancing by the study of individual members of the school is even more obvious, each account being preceded by a brief outline of the education and philosophical contributions of the man under discussion.

Next there is a chapter on Pragmatism, which in turn is followed by an account of the Older Realists, a group of thinkers who do not form a definite school but who have a certain external connection with one another: Hodgson, Dawes Hicks, Cook Wilson and others.

In the New Realism we have "a genuinely British growth which has grown in conformity with the best traditions of the indigenous or national philosophy". Its pioneer was George Edward Moore, but the figure that looms largest in the public eye is that of Bertrand Russell, of whom we are given a very long account. Other members of this school are Whitehead, Joad and J. E. Turner.

Finally there are sections on Mathematical Logic, the Philosophy of Natural Science, Psychology, Religious Philosophy and (very briefly treated) English Neo-Scholasticism.

When we remember that the author is a German we cannot but marvel at the breadth and depth of his erudition in this field, while we at the same time appreciate his work as a magnificent contribution to that rapprochement between the two nations by way of a common culture which it is his declared object to promote.

In his *Approach to Philosophy*<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hawkins aims to present an outline of philosophy in an epistemological setting. This

<sup>1</sup> By D. J. B. Hawkins. Pp. 117. (Sands: The Paladin Press. 5s.)

demands in the first place an analysis of one's mental world with a view to the greatest possible clarity. Common sense provides a negative test of the validity of the process. From an analysis of immediate experience the author arrives at the establishment of a real object, the sense-datum, and so to the reality of the material world. Similarly he can validate the common-sense conviction of the existence of the self, of one's own mind and of other minds. A final stage in the process is to see ourselves and our surroundings in the time sequence, wherein we are confronted with the fact of change. And here is found the basic principle for our proof of the existence of God and for the investigation of His attributes. With God and His universe before us we are in a position to face the problem of conduct and morality.

It will be seen at once that this brief essay is very comprehensive. Dr. Hawkins has chosen well the salient points in that total scheme of things which is the subject matter of philosophy, and has succeeded in presenting a satisfying and well proportioned argument; and that in such little space is a *tour de force*.

T. E. FLYNN.



## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### ROSE-COLOURED VESTMENTS.

Is there any justification for the use of rose-coloured vestments on the Feast of Holy Innocents? (E.B.M.)

#### REPLY.

An anonymous writer in the (American) *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1902, XXVII, p. 661, states that rose-colour is to be used on the *Octave* of Holy Innocents, but no authority is given, and the liturgical writers we have consulted, Crogaert, De Herdt and others, restrict its use to *Laetare* and *Gaudete* Sundays. The writer mentioned gives symbolic reasons for the colour, the blend of red and white representing martyrdom and virginity, but the usual explanation for its use on *Laetare* Sunday is the fact that the Roman ceremony of blessing the golden rose takes place on that day; because of its analogy with mid-Lent, rose-colour came to be used on *Gaudete* Sunday as well. The only justification for its use apart from these two Sundays would be a duly accepted local custom. We cannot trace the existence of such a custom anywhere, but it is well known that departures from the common liturgical law are permitted in Spain, as the use of blue vestments on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception; Gasparri records that wax-coloured vestments are permitted by the Holy See in certain dioceses.<sup>1</sup> Customs of this kind are the more easily accepted, since the law determining colours in vestments is generally considered to bind only *sub levi*, and colours not liturgically correct may be used for any reasonable cause, for example, the lack of vestments of the appropriate colour.

If there is no local custom and no justifying cause, it is wrong to use rose-coloured vestments except on the two Sundays as directed by *Caereemoniale Episcoporum*, Lib. II, cap. 12, n. 11, and by various decrees S. R. C.

E.J.M.

<sup>1</sup> *De Eucharistia*, §693.

## INVALID MARRIAGE AND DANGER OF DEATH.

Titius, a Catholic, is married in the Protestant Church to Bertha, a non-Catholic, who has refused to sign the mixed marriage guarantees. Being in danger of death, may a priest leave him in good faith concerning his matrimonial affairs, and give him the last sacraments, or is he bound to extract a promise that he will not live with Bertha until the guarantees have been given and the marriage revalidated? (V.F.)

## REPLY.

The simplest and most practical way of dealing with the matter is to abstract altogether from the mixed marriage difficulty, and to obtain from Titius an undertaking that, if he recovers, he will regularize *coram Ecclesia* his attempted marriage with Bertha. In the circumstances of serious illness, this suffices as a reparation of the scandal. He cannot be left in good faith since his marriage in the Protestant Church is a public act with public scandal accompanying. It is advisable to leave the issue concerning the guarantees to be settled when the marriage is revalidated, since an undertaking to observe this law may be taken as implied in his general intention to regularize the marriage. If the priest introduces this problem of guarantees to be given in the future, Titius might be led expressly to repudiate a future marriage *coram Ecclesia*, since he might regard the guarantees as an impossible condition. To this extent, at least, Titius may be left in good faith. By obtaining a general promise to regularize the union, the priest has sufficient for the purpose of explaining, if necessary, to the faithful that Titius has been reconciled to the Church.

The only other method is by dispensing the impediment and revalidating the marriage, using the wide powers given in Canon 1043 and 1044, but a dispensation from *Mixed Religion*, even in *periculo mortis*, requires the customary guarantees to be obtained, though not necessarily in writing.

Whichever method is employed, absolution may be

<sup>1</sup> Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1935, Vol. X, p. 59.

given from the censure of Canon 2319 §1, 1, since its reservation ceases in *periculo mortis*, and there is no obligation to have recourse to the Ordinary if the person recovers (Canon 2352).  
E. J. M.

# MARRIAGE IN NON-CATHOLIC CHURCH

According to Fr. Davis, Vol. III, p. 481, two Catholics who attempt marriage in a registry office or in a non-Catholic church incur no censure in the common law. Is it, therefore, necessary to have recourse to the Ordinary before revalidating the marriages of such persons? (M.)

## REPLY

(i) Revalidation of a registry office marriage requires no intervention of the Ordinary, unless there is some local legislation on the matter, or an impediment requiring dispensation.

(ii) The censure reserved to the Ordinary in Canon 2319 §1, 1 must be interpreted strictly, and particularly with reference to Canon 2219 §3: "Non licet poenam de persona ad personam vel de casu ad casum producere, quamvis par adsit ratio, imo gravior." The censure is inflicted on those acting against the law of Canon 1063 §1 (mixed marriages), not on those acting against the law of Canon 1094 (canonical form of marriage). Fr. Davis does not say that two Catholics incur no censure, but that they do not incur the censure of Canon 2319 §1, 1, in which the *delictum* is complete by the parties to a mixed marriage appearing before a non-Catholic minister in the circumstances of that Canon.<sup>1</sup>

(iii) Though escaping the specific censure of Canon 2319 §1, 1, two Catholics who appear before a non-Catholic minister might come under the censure of §1, 2 of the canon, against those marrying with the intention, explicit or implicit, to bring up their children outside of the Church. Supposing they escape this censure, it is quite likely that

<sup>1</sup> Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1933, Vol. V, p. 159.  
Vol. xvi.

they are guilty of heresy and the censure attached to it. At the very least they are "suspected" of heresy by their act of *communicatio in sacris*, as provided for in Canon 2316: they are to be considered as heretics, and as excommunicated after a period of six months, unless the suspicion is removed by repentance (Canon 2315).

Therefore, although not included in the censure of Canon 2319 §1, 1, the case should, in practice, be referred to the Ordinary before the marriage is revalidated, unless the priest, from his knowledge of the law of censures, is able to decide that no censure has been incurred and that the parties are free to marry. Owing to the complexity of the matter, local legislation often requires all marriage revalidations to be referred to the Ordinary, as in n. 19 of *Statuta Dioecesis Lancastriensis*.

E. J. M.

### MISSA PRIVATA

Would you please define what is meant by a "private Mass? May one say that a Mass is private which is said in a parish church at a side altar? (M.)

### REPLY

Unhappily the term *Missa Privata* has many meanings and it is not possible to give an accurate definition which will cover them all; the present writer, at least, will not attempt this task. The meaning must be carefully discerned according to the context in which it is used. (a) In the first centuries of the Church, one *public* Mass, often with several priests celebrating together, dominated the liturgy; it was the stational Mass offered for the whole Christian community at which all took part. From the time of St. Augustine Masses began to be offered in addition to the traditional ones, and they were known as *private* Masses. (b) The ancient terminology has continued, to some extent, inasmuch as certain Masses may be celebrated by a priest in his *public* or official capacity, e.g. the conventual and the parochial Mass.<sup>1</sup> Occasionally we find that authors use the term

<sup>1</sup> Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1936, XI, pp. 61, 156, 435, for a discussion of the meaning of *Missa Paroecialis*.

*missa privata* in contradistinction to the *conventual* Mass, and this appears to be the sense in *Rub. Gen. Missalis*, IV, 3. (c) In dealing with votive Masses, Roman decrees give a special meaning to the word *private* in contradistinction to a votive Mass "pro re gravi et publica . . . mandato vel consensu Ordinarii".<sup>1</sup> (d) Canon 2262 § 2 permits Mass to be said for excommunicated persons "privatim ac remoto scandalo". The sources of this law which disallow Mass to be said for them publicly<sup>2</sup> contain a distinction between *public* and *private* which is not liturgical at all, but is based on avoiding the publicity which might cause scandal to the faithful. The commonest meaning of all, which we have kept to the last, assigns to *private* the sense of *Low Mass*, *Missa privata*, in contradistinction to the *Solemn Mass*. Thus the title of *Rub. Gen. Missalis XVII* is "De Ordine genuflectendi, stendi et standi in Missa privata et solemni", and the rubric at the end of the Mass on Wednesday in Holy Week reads, "Triduo sequenti prohibentur omnes Missae privatae".

We think that, unless some other meaning must be understood from the context, *Missa privata* should be defined as *Missa lecta*. The answer to the second part of our correspondent's question is obviously affirmative, that is to say, the notion of *private* Mass is not to be restricted to the case of Mass said in a building, such as a private Oratory, to which the public are not admitted.

E. J. M.

#### MARRIAGE REVALIDATION

The civil registrar declined to attend at the revalidation of a mixed marriage which had been attempted in a Protestant church; in his view the marriage in the Protestant church was civilly valid and the State had no further interest in it. What should a parish priest do in these circumstances? (ENDA).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Addit. et Variat. in Rub. Missalis*, II n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Periodica*, 1931, XX, p. 81.

## REPLY

(i) If he desires to revalidate the marriage by renewing the consent of the parties with the canonical form, it is alleged that he would be liable to prosecution by assisting at the marriage without the intervention of a registrar in cases of marriage attempted in a Protestant church (C. of E.). civil marriages in a registry office are in a different category and may be revalidated without any further civil formality. We have heard of several instances in different parts of the country where the district registrar was ignorant of this distinction, as well he might be; it is a strictly correct interpretation of the law which was not perceived by anyone up to a few months ago. He can be brought to attend, either by persuading him that it is his duty to do so, or by applying to his superintendent.

(ii) Actually, the simplest method is to apply to the Ordinary for a *sanatio* in all marriages of this kind, having first obtained the usual guarantees required for mixed marriages.

E. J. M.

## INDULGENCED PRAYERS BEFORE AND AFTER MASS

Assuming that one says all the prayers in the Breviary and Missal assigned before and after Office or Mass, what must one do in order to gain the indulgences attached to each one separately? (A.M.J.V.)

## REPLY

The question has reference to the newly promulgated indulgences contained in *Preces et Pia Opera* n. 688-693 which are now to be printed in Breviaries and Missals. The list may be seen in the issue of this journal, November 1938, p. 451. By reciting all of these prayers many partial and plenary indulgences may be gained on the same day. In many cases a partial indulgence is granted for the single recitation of a prayer, a plenary indulgence if it is said daily.

for a month, for example, the *Adoro Te Devote* obtains five years for a single recitation and a plenary indulgence, on the usual conditions, if recited for a month; if a person desires both the partial and the plenary indulgence, what is the minimum that he must do?

Canon 933: "Uni eidemque rei vel loco plures ex variis titulis adnecti possunt indulgentiae; sed uno eodemque opere, cui ex variis titulis indulgentiae adnexae sint, non possunt plures acquiri indulgentiae, nisi opus requisitum sit confessio vel communio, aut nisi aliud expresse cautum sit." Examples of the application of the last clause in this canon are found in the Rosary, which may be blessed with both Dominican and Crozier indulgences, both obtainable by one recitation<sup>1</sup>; also in the Apostolic Indulgences granted by Pius XI, 17 February, 1922, which, as decided by a later decision, 14 June, 1922, could be gained cumulatively with indulgences already existing.<sup>2</sup> In these cases the rule of Canon 933 is suspended by an express declaration to the contrary. Other cases which lack this express provision are governed by the rule that, apart from Confession and Holy Communion, one and the same pious work will not gain several indulgences.

In the Indulgences under discussion, confession and communion suffice according to the directions of Canon 931. The other conditions must be repeated for each indulgence one desires to gain. For example, if prayer for the Pope's intention is required, *Pater Ave and Gloria* must be recited not once, but as many times as there are indulgences. With regard to the cumulation of a partial and a plenary indulgence attached to the same prayer, various views are possible. It could be maintained, we think, that the last clause of Canon 933 is verified in the terms of the grant, e.g. *Adoro Te Devote*: "Indulgentia quinque annorum; plenaria suetis conditionibus, quotidiana rythmi recitatione in integrum mensem producta." Five years are gained each day, and a plenary indulgence at the end of the month. Or it could be said that a person intending to gain the plenary indulgence does not obtain each day the partial one, owing to Canon 933; if for any reason he does not persevere for a month, he then gains the partial indulgence.

<sup>1</sup> S. C. Indulg., 12 June, 1907.

<sup>2</sup> *Periodica*, 1922, XI, p. 125.

Another view might be that he gains each day the partial indulgence, and at the end of the month a plenary indulgence, not precisely for the prayers already said but by accomplishing a distinct good work, namely, persevering in the prayer for a month.

We have received, of late, a large number of queries about Indulgences, dealing for the most part with methods for gaining as many as possible with the minimum of "pious work". It is a perfectly legitimate mental exercise and appears, at first sight, to be encouraged by the wealth and variety of indulgences offered for our choice, and the notable differences of proportion between them. But an indulgence is attached to a religious act to encourage people to perform it. The Church has always directed certain prayers to be said by the priest before and after Mass, although the precise nature of the obligation may be in dispute. It would be interesting to know whether many of the clergy, who have not been accustomed to recite them, are now doing so in order to gain the new indulgences which have been more publicly promulgated.

E. J. M.

#### "OBTULERUNT PRO EO"

How are these words to be interpreted? They occur frequently in the rite of the feast of the Purification, in the Processional Antiphon, in Matins and Lauds, but are not scriptural. Are they one of the rare instances of an error in the Missal?

The Sacrifices of the Burnt offering of the lamb and of the Sin offering of the dove, or for the poor the sacrifices of two doves, were for the purification of the mother and not sacrifices on behalf of the child (*pro eo*). The firstborn was redeemed at the price of five shekels.

Can these words be loosely translated "with regard to Him", or simply admitted to be a mistake?

(H. J. F. C.)

#### REPLY

The facts regarding the offerings of the lamb and the dove for the purification of the mother, and the redemption



of the child with five shekels, are not in dispute. And there can be no doubt that, in its strict sense and more obvious implication, the phrase quoted above is inaccurate.

It remains doubtful, I think, whether the words were used in any strict and exclusive sense by the compilers of the office. In the first place, *pro* can certainly be used as virtually the equivalent of *ob* and *propter*, and it might be argued that since the whole rite was occasioned by the child-bearing, the offering was made on account of the child.

If this appears to be too subtle an argument, it must, at all events, be allowed that the mistake, if any, was brought about by the rather striking vagueness of St. Luke's text (ii, 22ff). To begin with, there is the curious reading of most MSS. in v. 22 with reference to the time of "*their* purification". Whether this refers (supposing that it is the correct reading) to the mother and the Child, or to Mary and Joseph, is, of course, disputed. In any case, it might be misunderstood. (See Lagrange's argument in *Ev. selon S. Luc*, 2nd ed., 1921, p. 82 *in loc.* on the possibility here of a twofold sense for *katharismos*, i.e. purification of the mother, and ransom in the case of the Child.) But even more interesting is the vagueness of vv. 23-24, of which Lagrange writes (op. cit., p. 83): "Qui n'eût pas connu très bien la Loi devait supposer que le sacrifice était offert en vue de l'enfant, comme pour Samuel . . . (I Regn. i, 24ff)."

I conclude that to me it is not clear whether this is a case of indeliberate error or conscious vagueness (in agreement with the vagueness of the source), as regards the office of the Purification. I do not know. Nor, I should suppose, does anybody else.

J. M. T. B.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

- (1) *Sacra Congregatio Rituum*: "SUPER DUBIO AN SIGNANDA SIT COMMISSIO REASSUMPTIONIS CAUSAE CANONIZATIONIS B. ANTONII M. CLARET CONF. PONT. IN CASU ET AD EFFECTUM DE QUO AGITUR" (A.A.S. 1938, xxx, p. 382).

Humillimum Famulum suum B. Antonium Mariam Claret, Archiepiscopum Traianopolitan. iam S. Iacobi de Cuba, Congregationum Filiorum Immaculati Cordis B. M. V. et Sororum Docentium ab Immaculata conditorem, sapientissimus ac misericors Deus magis magisque exaltare velle videtur. Enimvero dum in Hispania nefarii homines ipsius humani generis hostes, *astiterunt . . . et convenerunt in unum adversus Dominum et adversus Christum eius* (Ps., 2), plusquam biscenti ex Beati religiosa familia sodales sanguinem potius fundere quam ab Ecclesia deficere, uti fertur, maluerunt. Qui magnificus filiorum triumphus in gloriam redundat Patris. Quin immo nonnulla signa, ipso Beato interveniente, post beatificationis sollemnia quae in Vaticana Basilica die 25 Februarii a. 1934 celebrata sunt, a Deo parata feruntur, quae ad eiusdem Canonizationem viam sternere videntur.

Quapropter R. P. Ioannes Postius, Congregationis Filiorum Immaculati Cordis B. M. V. Procurator et Postulator generalis, apud sacram hanc Rituum Congregationem, ut Canonizationis Causa resumeretur, institit. In Ordinariis ideo Comitibus die 5 mensis huius ad Vaticanas aedes habitis Eñus ac Rñus D. Cardinalis Alexander Verde, Causae Ponens seu Relator, dubium proposuit disceptandum: *An signanda sit Commissio Reassumptionis Causae in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur*. Et Eñi ac Rñi PP. Cardinales, attenta Eñi Ponentis relatione, perpensis quoque Postulatoris litteris Beatissimo Patri oblatis, audito R. P. D. Salvatore Natucci, Fidei Promotore Generali, responderunt: *Affirmative*, seu *Signandam esse Commissionem Reassumptionis Causae, si Sanctissimo placuerit*.

Facta de his Ssño D. N. Pio Papae XI, subsignata dñe per subscriptum Cardinalem relatione, Sanctitas Sua, Rescriptum eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis ratum habens, propria manu signare dignata est Commissionem Re-

assumptionis Causae Canonizationis eiusdem B. Antonii  
M. Claret.

Datum Romae, die 6 Iulii a. D. 1938.

C. Card. LAURENTI, *Praefectus*.

A. Carinci, *Secretarius*.

This document concerns the process of canonization of Blessed Antony M. Claret, founder of the *Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary*, an Institute with houses in the dioceses of Westminster and Brentwood. The process is of interest for a further reason, demonstrating the care with which the Holy See proceeds in the preliminaries of beatification. Despite the fact that the matter was, it seems, in the hands of Maroto, a famous canonist who was a member of the Institute, the *Congregation of Rites* rejected one of the miracles which, according to Canon 2117, are required before beatification. With courage undaunted, the process was started again with a more accurately attested miracle, the cure of a nun at Barcelona in 1930, and the beatification took place on 25 February, 1934.

E.J.M.

(2) *Commissio Pontificia de Re Biblica* "De Praemiis a Pontificia Commissione Biblica Conferendis" (A.A.S. 1938, xxx, p. 420).

A Pontificia Commissione de Re Biblica, anno 1939, duplex praemium, utrumque centum dollariorum, pro dissertationibus de argumento biblico conscribendis distribuetur.

Argumenta tractanda haec sunt :

(i) Pro primo praemio obtinendo : *S. Ignatius Antiochenus novitne quartum Evangelium ?*

Textus tum quarti Evangelii tum S. Ignatii lingua graeca referendi sunt.

(ii) Pro secundo praemio obtinendo : *De charitate erga proximum in Veteri Testamento*.

Ius ad primum praemium contendendi iis omnibus iisque solis competit, qui inter auditores cursus theologici in Seminario quodam Maiori adscripti sunt.

Ius autem ad secundum praemium contendendi iis omnibus iisque solis competit, qui scholas Facultatis cuius-

dam theologiae vel Athenaei, cui fas est gradus academicos conferre, frequentant.

Dissertationes linguis latina, anglica, gallica, germanica, hispanica, italica exarari poterunt, at scriptoria machina conscriptae esse debent.

Nomen auctoris non in ipsa dissertatione, sed in folio seiuncto indicabitur simul cum inscriptione Seminarii vel Facultatis seu Athenaei cuius auctor est alumnus et cum attestazione Rectoris vel Magistri Sacrae Scripturae. Folium hoc obsignatum exterius lemmate notetur, initio dissertationis repetendo, ac simul cum ipsa dissertatione usque ad diem 31 mensis octobris anni 1939 ad infrascriptum Secretarium Pontificiae Commissionis Biblicae Romam mittatur.<sup>1</sup>

De collatione praemiorum decernent Eñi DD. Cardinales Pontificiae Commissioni Biblicae praepositi, iuxta legitima suffragia Revmorum DD. Consultorum eiusdem. Ubi res postulaverit, praemia constituta etiam duobus candidatis per partes aequales vel proportionatas adiudicari poterunt. Sententia vero in Actis Apostolicae Sedis publici iuris fiet.

Romae, die 31 Octobris 1938.

Ioannes Baptista Frey, C. S. Sp., *Secretarius*.

### (3) (SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA) (OFFICIUM DE INDULGENTIIS)

"Indulgentia plenaria *Toties Quoties* die II Mensis Novembris Vel die Dominica subsequenti lucriferi potest." (A.A.S. 1939, xxxi, p. 23.)

Summus Pontifex Pius X, per Decretum S. Congregationis S. Officii die xxv mensis Iunii a. MDCCCXIV datum,<sup>4</sup> omnibus christifidelibus, qui quamlibet ecclesiam aut quodlibet publicum oratorium (vel semipublicum pro legitime utentibus) die secunda mensis Novembris pie visitavissent, plenariam indulgentiam "*toties quoties*" suetis conditionibus lucranda concessit, fidelibus defunctis solummodo applicanda.

<sup>1</sup> Al Rev. Padre Giov. Battista Frey, Segretario della Pontificia Commissione Biblica, via Santa Chiara, 42.—Roma (117).

<sup>4</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, vol. VI, a. 1914, p. 378.

At identidem, decursu temporis, ad hoc Sacrum Tribunal supplicationes pervenerunt, quibus postulabatur ut eadem indulgentia die quoque dominica subsequenti lucriferi posset; idque eo consilio ut ii etiam pretiosissima hac concessione frui possent, qui die Commemorationis omnium fidelium defunctorum id non peregerint. Quam ad rem SS<sup>mus</sup> D. N. Pius divina Providentia Pp. XI, in audientia die x mensis Decembris a. MDCCCXXXVIII infra scripto Cardinali Paenitentiario Maiori concessa, statuere ac decernere dignatus est plenariam eiusmodi indulgentiam vel die ii mensis Novembris, vel subsequenti die dominica lucriferi posse, firmis manentibus ceteris conditionibus tum memorati Decreti S. Congregationis S. Officii, tum Decreti S. Paenitentiariae quoad plenariam indulgentiam "toties quoties" lucranda.<sup>1</sup>

Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Apostolicarum Litterarum in forma brevi expeditione et contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Paenitentiariae Apostolicae, die 2 Ianuarii 1939.

L. Card. LAURI, *Paenitentiarius Maior*.

S. LUZIO, *Regens*.

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, vol. XXII, a. 1930, p. 363.

## CHURCH MANAGEMENT

### II. CHURCH LINENS

**T**HE non-sacred linens are the Communion cloths, the credence cloths, and the finger towels. These need not be blessed.

#### COMMUNION CLOTHS

We have lately been reminded in these pages that, whether it is to our liking or not, the obligation of retaining the Communion cloth remains in force. The warning is a timely one, for there appears to be abroad an erroneous opinion that where there is a handsome altar-rail having a flat polished marble top, it is permissible to dispense with the cloth. The Communion cloth is not to be regarded as merely a utilitarian requirement. Its presence is now purely ceremonial, but it becomes an object of peculiar reverence when we consider that, whatever may have been its original purpose, it is a graceful reminder to those who approach the Holy Table that they are partakers of the sacrificial banquet. For this reason also it is desirable that as much as possible the character of a tablecloth should be preserved, embroideries and fringes of lace should be avoided, and the cloth should not be left permanently hanging in position as a kind of drapery to the rails. The best possible arrangement is to spread a plain linen cloth, appropriately wide, along the top of the rails, and to fold it up and put it away at the end of Mass; a few hooks and tapes spaced out at unobtrusive intervals may be used to prevent the cloth from slipping.

There is no objection to the use of a good cotton material, but the Church has always shown a predilection for "fair linen", and as Dom Roulin has neatly expressed it, "A cloth of good linen and entirely unadorned is most in conformity with the spirit of the liturgy". (Vestments and Vesture, p. 39.)

#### CREDENCE CLOTHS

It is not at all necessary to have a credence table. Liturgical authorities prefer a niche, fenestella, of sufficiently

large size to accommodate not only the sacrarium but also a shelf for the cruets, which also may be used for storing the missal and canons in readiness for daily Mass. Strictly speaking, the credence table is not distinct from the abacus of the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, which is a table reserved to hold the liturgical requirements for solemn, and more especially episcopal, functions. However, if a permanent credence table is used it should be covered, on festive occasions, by a single linen cloth which should hang down on either side like the top cloth of the altar. On Good Friday, in penitential seasons and on occasions of mourning, the cloth should cover only the actual surface of the table. When these rules are observed a credence table presents an elegant appearance; an untidy and incorrectly dressed table is a disfigurement to the sanctuary. Cotton material may be used, but here again the Church's preference for linen should be respected.

#### FINGER TOWELS

There are no regulations as to size, and what has been said with regard to the material of the other non-sacred linens is of equal application. These articles should be towels, in fact, and not mere wisps of flimsy cambric indistinguishable from ladies' handkerchiefs. A cross or a letter L worked in coloured thread in one of the corners makes a serviceable mark to distinguish from purificators.

. . . . .

To keep good linen brilliantly white it should be washed in soft water and dried in the sun. A little starching improves, but to starch cloths until they become almost as stiff as boards, and linen vestments until they bulge like buckram, is an error which makes for ugliness and discomfort. It is about time that we set our faces sternly against the deplorable practice of pleating. About the year 1500 accordion pleating was introduced into the fashions of the world and has continued in varying degrees and phases until our own times. The worldly ecclesiastics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries adopted the new

fashion, and so it has remained. Liturgical vestments have never gained from copying the frivolous fashions of the world. Can anyone really see anything beautiful in box pleats which make sacred linens and linen vestments to resemble the paper frills used in the culinary art on the one hand, and certain feminine fashions on the other? Linen vestments are manly garments, and the beauty of albs and surplices when cut full so that they hang in graceful, flowing lines is such that it cannot be enhanced.

J. P. R.

Lord North  
THE  
the  
profound  
the thir  
a promi  
was at t  
or later  
career i  
particul  
given us  
He does  
that we  
The  
that No  
the han  
Parliam  
Americ  
Englan  
seeks to  
statesm  
rare an  
desire  
in orde  
than a  
out a  
failure  
in Eng  
respon  
time w  
North  
certain  
On  
with  
Fox  
impor  
only  
with  
A



## BOOK REVIEWS

*Lord North.* By W. Barring Pemberton. (Longmans. 21s.)

THE publication of the correspondence of George III and the researches of Professor L. B. Namier have led to a profound revision of opinion on the first years of the reign of the third Hanoverian king. As Lord North played such a prominent part in English life at the time when George was at the height of his powers, it was inevitable that sooner or later an attempt would be made to place that statesman's career in the new setting which has been revealed. It is particularly fortunate that Mr. Pemberton, who has already given us a study of Carteret, should give us this new picture. He does so with the balanced judgement and wide knowledge that we have come to associate with his name.

The Whig view, repeated in countless textbooks, is that North was the King's puppet "dangled by strings in the hands of a sovereign, whose set purpose was to debauch Parliament and to impose autocratic notions upon the American colonies as a prelude to introducing them into England". Against this view Mr. Pemberton reacts and seeks to show that even if North cannot be classed as a great statesman he can be called a good man, and good men were rare among eighteenth-century politicians. North had no desire to be the king's chief minister, he consented to be so in order to save the king from what the king loathed more than anything else—Faction. As chief minister he carried out a policy towards the American colonies which was a failure, but which was the policy of the vast majority of people in England, though till recently North has had to bear the responsibility almost alone. The general election held at the time was one of the least corrupt in the century, and it endorsed North's policy, giving him three hundred and twenty-one certain supporters in a house of five hundred and fifty-eight.

One great mistake he made, and that was his coalition with Fox. Even though North was never a Tory, he and Fox had almost always been in opposite camps over all important issues, so that the coalition was unnatural and only lasted as long as it did because North contented himself with the position of a sleeping partner.

Apart from this there is little with which to reproach

North. He was a sound financier, a good debater, he could answer the opposition in good temper and with humour, and he could remain superbly unruffled for, till his very last year, he could always curl up on the front bench and sleep throughout the most violent attacks that were being made upon himself. In an age of widespread corruption his hands remained unsoiled. He may have lost the American Colonies but he saved Canada.

R. B.

*Pre-Reformation England.* By H. Maynard Smith, D.D.Oxon.  
Demy 8vo. Pp. xv + 556. (Macmillan & Co. 25s.)

THIS is a remarkable book, not least because of the temper it displays. It is calm, generous, sincere, exceedingly readable, and, apart from one or two questionable assumptions, reasonably objective. One might even dare to call it the most fair-minded approach to the Reformation which has yet appeared in English. It sets out to perform a colossal task, and it is no discredit to the author to say that it does not entirely achieve its purpose. But could any one writer, in a single volume, and of his own learning, sum up satisfactorily the state of mind which was the prelude to the upheaval of the sixteenth century? Is there as yet any accepted interpretation of the fifteenth century with its apparent contradictions? Has anybody yet assessed synthetically, in English, the new interpretations of the Renaissance? The *Cambridge Mediaeval History* leaves much to be desired, and one looks forward with eagerness to what Professor E. F. Jacob will have to say in the sixth volume of the *Oxford History of England*. Meanwhile Canon Maynard Smith deserves the thanks of all students for courageously undertaking a prodigious work.

The book is divided into two parts, almost equal in length. In the first the author discusses the condition of pre-Reformation England in terms of the state of the Church, popular religion, superstitions and abuses, economic, social and political change. The treatment is balanced, sympathetic and agreeable. In the second part an attempt is made, with less success, to account for the tendencies of the age. Lollardy receives great attention, and Wycliff, "the impatient pragmatist", seems to me to be misinterpreted. Reading his writings, one is more inclined to rate him as

a subtle  
truth o  
to the p  
Commu  
defect i  
rising c  
mercha  
handica  
with no  
for inst  
article  
Review  
trade (c  
used w  
Tawne  
the au  
pathetic  
mind.  
apprec  
chapters  
welcom  
scholar  
synthe  
out lea  
of the  
of Nor  
import  
Nation  
the fif  
nowhe  
Th  
More,  
and is  
classifi  
Catho  
is a va  
and i  
bringi  
in ma  
same

Vol

a subtle, tortuous and involved theorist, and I doubt the truth of the conclusion that "the proportion of Lollards to the population was much the same as the proportion of Communists to the population today". A more serious defect is the failure to assess adequately the influence of the rising commercial and middle classes, and the growth of the merchant mind. The whole economic approach is in fact handicapped by dependence on Cunningham and Ashley, with no account taken of the immensely important work of, for instance, Mr. Postan or Dr. Eileen Power. The former's article on Credit in Medieval Trade in the *Economic History Review* (January, 1928), or the latter's account of the wool trade (*Cambridge Historical Journal*, 1926), might have been used with profit. It is odd, also, to note that Professor Tawney's name is consistently misspelt. On the other hand the author's High Anglican standpoint makes him sympathetic in the main to Catholic teaching and the Catholic mind. He defends the possibility of miracles with spirit, and appreciates the all-important position of the Mass. A chapter on the English mystics is significant and very welcome, though, as with the chapter on the history of scholasticism, the tendency is to enumeration rather than synthesis. While far from superficial, the treatment throughout leans more to the listing of writings than to discussion of the movement of ideas. There is no adequate account of Nominalism, though an attempt is made to indicate the importance of Nicholas of Cusa; while the implications of Nationalism, perhaps the most important phenomenon of the fifteenth century, though touched on incidentally, are nowhere specifically treated.

The author is sympathetic in general to St. Thomas More, lays insufficient stress on the naturalism of Erasmus, and is too lenient to Henry VIII, who is somewhat oddly classified as "the traditionalist" in a chapter entitled "The Catholic Reformers". Yet despite its deficiencies this book is a valuable addition to Reformation literature and history, and it is to be hoped that a further projected volume, bringing the story to the death of Elizabeth, will not be long in making an appearance, and that it will be marked by the same balance, urbanity and distinction.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

*Pyrenean.* By J. B. Morton. Pp. 212. (Longmans. 8s. 6d.)

I HAVE never been nearer the Pyrenees than Lourdes ; nor have I read Mr. Belloc (save, of course, for *Tarantella*) or any devotee of those mountains other than Mr. Morton—negative achievements hardly enough for reviewing any *Pocket-guide for Pyreneans* or *Mountaineers' Vade-mecum*, but ample qualifications for revealing to stop-at-homes like myself the rich humour and wisdom of Mr. Morton's philosophy and the consistent quality of his prose.

This is an account of the adventures of Miles Walker on his journey from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic ; the pseudonym, whether one prefixes to it the definite or indefinite article, being a light disguise in the Beachcomber vein for Mr. Morton. There probably never was an age when more travelling was done with less intellectual equipment for enjoying the adventure, for we live in a generation with a terminus-complex. Whether or no our *terminus a quo* be the Blue Train, the *Edelweiss*, the *Golden Arrow* or merely the family Ford, it absorbs our whole interest until such time as we reach our *terminus ad quem*, which we have timed to a nicety. Of little concern to us are the oddments that pass by the way. Quite otherwise is it with Mr. Morton. Like another Christian making his Pilgrim's Progress, he is fully taken up with the adventures that befall him on his timeless journey—nothing much of the kind that goes to make what is called "good fiction", but rather of the sort any man might stumble across, that is, any man with Mr. Morton's joy of living and moving among unspoilt places and peoples.

In sunshine or rain, under cloudless skies or bowed beneath an oppressive blanket of grey mist, he ambles aimlessly or trudges a dogged forty miles a day. He is moon-struck, sun-struck, plods along in grim silence deep in the Slough of Despond or sings gaily to himself, the mountains, a fat woman or an innkeeper's dark-eyed wife. As a matter of course he slips into Church for an early Mass or to say his prayers ; with considerable frequency and enviable heartiness he eats and drinks and smokes. A little ruefully, perhaps, he becomes the Interpreter of Modern Science to an old man mystified by the Gramophone ; the old man remains unconvinced. He falls among robbers,

indulges in the rare luxury of a spitting duel with an ill-tempered muleteer whom he pinks in the chest for his pains; another contest, Irish blackthorn *versus* Basque makila, left Mr. Morton exhausted and very thirsty but preferring to stand up for his drinks!

And all the time little scraps of the Pyrenean past are recalled or there is a casual side-track to Ireland (which, of course, he knows and loves better even than the Irish themselves), or odd tales are told apropos of nothing (how at home Miles Walker would have been with the Prioress, the Knight or the Miller, to say nothing of the Wife of Bath!)

All this is accompanied by Mr. Morton's vigorous views on life. His likes and dislikes are pronounced and unconcealed, especially the dislikes. English soup or chemical beer, "helpful" hikers, Pyrenean improvement schemes, the human lizards that lounge round the Riviera—all are brought under the lash of a Bellocian invective that seems at the same time unreasonable yet richly deserved. It is difficult to refrain from quoting some of the broader comments; still more so to pass over passages of fine descriptive power and depth—the sense of helplessness when lost in those awful mountains, the battling with the storm, the remarks on prayer. These and a hundred other gems of wisdom make the book something to ponder upon in solitude and then to read aloud to one's friends.

GORDON ALBION.

*The English Recusants: A Study of the Post-Reformation Catholic Survival and the Operation of the Recusancy Laws.* By Brian Magee. Introduction by Hilaire Belloc. Pp. xxx + 230. (Burns Oates, 1938. 10s. 6d.)

Of late years Mr. Belloc must often have smiled to himself (a little grimly, no doubt), at the mass of documentary evidence brought forward (not always by Catholic scholars), in support of the main points of his Reformation thesis, viz., that the religious revolution of the sixteenth century was in England forced on a reluctant people; that its official acceptance here was of vital importance to the endurance of Protestantism in Europe; that here as elsewhere, but more so, financial rather than doctrinal considerations entailed the ruthless official championship of

a movement which, even so, could never have been carried through but for the political chicanery of the first Cecil and the bureaucratic efficiency of the second, both men wielding the real power behind puppet thrones. And so on.

We have heard the case argued unceasingly with what may be termed, not unkindly and with a certain *double entendre*, Belloquacity. The argument turns up again (it is ever welcome), in the vigorous introduction contributed by Mr. Belloc to this solid and satisfying study of a subject that intrigues us all. In 1935-6 Mr. Magee wrote two articles for the *Dublin Review* on "England's Catholic Population in Penal Times." These he has now expanded and augmented into a statistical computation of the numerical strength of the Catholic body from the accession of Elizabeth to the approach of the Relief Acts, that is, covering the whole of the penal period.

This task is a complex one for three reasons. First, at no given moment was there an organized Catholic body in our modern sense of the term; secondly, until well into the eighteenth century the line of demarcation between Catholic and non-Catholic was not the strict thing it is today; thirdly, while it was left to the Catholic gentry to provide religious facilities for their co-religionists, the burden of fines, and therefore the temptation to apostasy, fell more heavily on them than on the poor. Though Mr. Magee makes a close study of the incidence of the Recusancy Fines, a complete assessment is still not possible, since, as he rightly maintains, the Laws were not applied as severely or as consistently as is sometimes thought. Reference to Bishop Mathew's *The Jacobean Age* will reveal that even Robert Cecil was content to show indulgence on occasion, while the present reviewer, in studying the reign of Charles I, found a still easier attitude of toleration.

Mr. Magee and Mr. Belloc properly stress certain dates as marking landslides rather than landmarks in the progressive dwindling of the Catholic body—the failure of the Armada, the Powder Plot, the defeat of Charles I, the Popish Plot, the accession of William and Mary; these were periodic shocks that shattered hopes of a Catholic revival.

The major portion of this book deals with the seventeenth century and the statistics given from State Papers, Parlia-

mentary, Ambassadorial, and private reports give it the greatest value as a work of reference for Catholic teachers, writers and apologists. It is to be hoped that the author will continue his researches, as his treatment of the eighteenth century is meagre, to say the least. Here and elsewhere, he could add to his findings by further reference to such works as Dr. Messenger's second volume on the Reformation, Brady's *Annals*, Estcourt and Payne's *English Catholic Non-jurors of 1715*, Burton's *Life of Challoner*, the various volumes of the *Catholic Record Society* and a number of reports among the Roman Transcripts in the Public Record Office. It is a pity that someone of Mr. Magee's industry and acumen cannot spend a few months foraging among the voluminous, ill-kept and fast-depreciating English papers in the Propaganda Archives, Rome.

GORDON ALBION.

*The Lessons and Gospels for Lent with an Introduction by*  
Conrad Pepler, O.P. (Coldwell. 5s.)

It is not very usual in this country to read the Lenten lessons and gospels in English at daily Mass, but I discovered last year that such was the practice of the Pastor of Our Lady of Lourdes' Church in New York City, the late Mgr. McMahon, whose recent death brought sorrow to a large circle of friends in this country as well as in his own. And a very edifying custom it was. But whether for public or for private use there can be no doubt that these selections from the Scriptures make most appropriate spiritual reading for Lent. And here they are gathered in a beautifully printed volume of handy size. Fr. Pepler in an historical introduction gives a guide to "the general design of the selection and the relation of these texts with the whole meaning of Lent".

T. E. F.

*Fear and Religion.* By the Rev. Aloysius Roche. Pp. 128.  
(Sands. 3s. 6d.)

THERE is undeniably much fear in the air at present, fear of some appalling catastrophe that may suddenly descend upon the peoples of the West; and because the fear is so widespread it invades the sphere of religion. In a cheerful and encouraging way Father Roche uses the teaching of Our

Lord to show how baseless are our fears if we carry out the divine commands and live in trust and love, inspired by faith. Where fear so widely prevails true charity is unknown; hence the return of European man to paganism. One cannot imagine the magnitude of the disaster to come if the practice of Christianity is not revived. The future happiness of Europe demands that hate give place to love, the "perfect love that casteth out fear".

Almost every aspect of fear is dealt with by the author. He speaks of the salutary fear which keeps man from sin and makes him fly to safety, and of the irrational fear which is as dangerous as disease. That fear of the Lord, the beginning of wisdom which shall "delight the heart" and which was seemingly unknown until the coming of Christ, is the subject of a particularly heartening chapter. Fear of death, of Purgatory (a most uncommon fear, this) and fear of Hell, find their place here; and the final fear is the fear of old age. Those in whom this dread of advancing years is strongly marked are always men and women of little or no religion, people who have never known the friendship of Christ. Old age may be the natural Calvary of life, but it can be a Calvary with many compensations. To grow old gracefully is to conquer the fears of life, to feel the strengthening joy of God-given promises soon to be fulfilled. L. T. H.



## QUID RESPONDENDUM? LETTERS TO IGNOTUS

III. From Jane, in hospital ; *aged 31.*

DEAR REVEREND FATHER,

Thank you for coming to see me this morning. But I haven't changed my mind. I am not sorry for what I did ; I am only sorry that I am alive. I am sorry they dragged me out of the water, and that the doctor got me round. I had gone through dying ; then why didn't they leave me alone ? God can't want me to go on living the life I have had to live with that brute ever since the day we were married. He tricked me into marriage to make me his slave. He was the father of my only child. He made my life a hell. God can't punish me worse for wanting and trying to end it. Often and often I have been tempted to finish him. I could have done it and no one would have known ; a drunken man might easily fall downstairs and break his neck. But I didn't want him to be damned ; so I tried to take my own life instead. Oh, why did they bring me back ?

Your unhappy child,

Jane.

### REPLIES TO CAPTAIN HAROLD — —

DEAR CAPTAIN,

As a military officer you will, I know, appreciate the absurdity of a private trying to override the commands of his commander, who is conducting a vital campaign. The Catholic Church—the Army of God—in which you are a private, is conducting a campaign for the salvation of souls. The plan has been mapped out by God Himself, and the Church is entrusted by Him to put it into execution.

It is not a case of your private opinion against that of Eugénie. It is a case of her private opinion, backed by the Church of England and the civil law, against the divinely guaranteed teaching of the Church of God.

Remember, Captain, that the letters "R.C." on a

soldier's identification disc are no passport to heaven. It is necessary to know the teaching of the Church and to put it into practice. Your letter points to the fact that there are serious gaps in your knowledge of the origin, constitution and authority of the Church.

Come along to me, and I shall try to repair those gaps through which the enemy of your soul may enter.

Praying God to enlighten and strengthen you,

Believe me,

Your candid friend,

Fr. Peter.

II. The Church is not unreasonable in regarding a Christian marriage as indissoluble, but it is a standard which is undoubtedly different to that which Eugénie's creed tolerates. As I understand her outlook, she claims the right to divorce and remarriage because she believes that she is free to act in this way. Am I right in supposing that she will have the same outlook on the second marriage which she proposes to contract with you? Her intention in contracting marriage needs investigating before you commit yourself, and I would gladly discuss the matter with you both at any convenient time. The principle of indissoluble marriage has another aspect which you may not have realized. Marriage is indissoluble, but on the other hand what Eugénie regards as marriage is not what the Church has in mind in declaring marriage indissoluble. It might well be that her first unhappy union was not a true marriage, in which case it would be possible for you to marry her after the matter has been very thoroughly examined by the Church. It would be a lengthy process but it might be worth while.

PASTOR.

(1) "Pa  
In t  
proving  
canon 1.  
voluntar  
spectent  
the state  
m 'bon  
mine).  
a benef  
October  
Englan  
ecclesia  
Now  
canon  
namely  
ecclesia  
through  
volunta  
the "do  
of read  
read "  
He the  
minste  
Propag  
the far  
ad ips  
VIII,  
1410,  
viz., "  
Fr  
ordin  
stratic  
judge  
Code  
presb  
from

## CORRESPONDENCE

### PAROCHIAL BENEFICES

(1) "Parochus" writes :

In the September CLERGY REVIEW Dr. McReavy proving that parishes in England were benefices quoted canon 1410 : "*Dotem beneficii constituunt . . . certae et voluntariae fidelium oblationes, quae ad beneficii rectorem spectent.*" Later, in a footnote of the same article, he made the statement that "in the average English parish there are no 'bona beneficialia', *only* 'bona ecclesiastica'" (italics mine). When I pointed out that it was impossible to have a benefice without a "dos beneficii" (CLERGY REVIEW, October, p. 376), he replied that he meant that there was in England no "dos beneficii" clearly distinct from the "dos ecclesiae" (CLERGY REVIEW, November, p. 467).

Now if Dr. McReavy will look carefully again at canon 1410 he will see that it deals with one thing only, namely, the "dos beneficii" ; it does not deal with "bona ecclesiastica" at all. This has been Dr. McReavy's mistake throughout. He wants us to hold that the "*certae et voluntariae fidelium oblationes*" of canon 1410 constitute the "dos beneficii" and the "dos ecclesiae" ; and that instead of reading "*quae ad beneficii rectorem spectent*" we must read "*quae ad beneficii rectorem et ad ecclesiae dotem spectent*". He then tells us that we must interpret this by the Westminster decree (binding "*simplices missionarii*" under Propaganda) which says that voluntary offerings made by the faithful "*habendae sunt pro bonis Ecclesiae*" and "*non ad ipsum sacerdotem pertinere repute(n)tur*". (II. Dec. VIII, 9 and 11). We object to this interpretation of canon 1410, and we repeat that it deals with one matter only, viz., "dos beneficii".

From the "dos beneficii" the parish priest is to pay all ordinary and minor expenses connected with the administration of his benefice (canon 1477, §§ 1 and 3). If his bishop judges him negligent, the remedy is clearly indicated in the Code (canon 1476, § 2). But other expenses (including presbytery repairs, canon 1477, § 2), are not demanded from the "dos beneficii" but from the "bona ecclesiae"

raised or held by persons clearly indicated in the Law (canon 1186, § 2). In England we have no "consilia fabricae" and few, if any, "patroni". But we have "parociani (quos tamen Ordinarius magis hortetur quam cogat)", who, thank God, by their wonderful generosity need no compulsion but only a word of exhortation.

Let us now seek the mind of these "fideles" and "parociani" who in different ways provide the "dos beneficii" and the "bona ecclesiae". My experience in parishes has been as follows, and it would be interesting to see whether it coincides with that of my brother priests. For the building and upkeep of church (and schools) the following offerings are made: Outdoor Collection, Altar Society, Seat Rents, Door Money (horrible thing!), Charity Sermons, Entertainments and Bazaars. (I have known "Lighting and Heating" Collections added to these; and in one church there was a second collection, for church upkeep, every Sunday, unless the bishop had ordered a collection on a particular Sunday. Thank God this was later abolished.) All these constitute the "dos ecclesiae". Stole fees I have found regarded by some people as "for the upkeep of the church" and by others as "an offering to the priest". By canon 1410 they appear to be part of the "dos beneficii".

Mass intentions and Christmas and Easter offerings (which we might call "*incertae oblationes*") are regarded by the people as extraordinary personal offerings to the priest.

There remain the ordinary Sunday and Holyday offertories. The people I have known regard these as given for the decent livelihood of the clergy; and they have sufficient confidence in their priests to know that whatever superfluity there may be will be devoted to the needs of the poor and the church. In other words they regard these offerings as forming the "dos beneficii".

Dr. McReavy seems to imply that the legislator of the Code did not understand conditions in England. In my opinion he was well aware of these conditions and clearly provided for them.

Lest there might appear to be any motive of avarice in taking a view contrary to that of Dr. McReavy may I add that as a rule I take no salary from offertories.

Dr. McR  
"Paro  
me. I a  
thing onl  
deal with  
to hold t  
of canon 1  
have I ev  
to the in  
"Parochu  
distinctio  
which, i  
stitute t  
(offertori  
normal  
minutely  
"Par  
sentence  
distinctio  
apparen  
1410 as  
offertori  
and tak  
tories"  
reject b  
was to l  
consisti  
and to  
in view  
hencefo  
of the  
constitu  
his hon  
what a  
rector"  
astical  
at Wes  
circum  
amour  
my op  
may c

Dr. McReavy writes in reply :

"Parochus", I am afraid, has completely misunderstood me. I am well aware that canon 1410 "deals with one thing only, namely, the *dos beneficii*", and that "it does not deal with *bona ecclesiastica* at all". I do not want "Parochus" to hold that the "*certae et voluntariae fidelium oblationes*" of canon 1410 constitute the *dos beneficii* and the *dos ecclesiae*, nor have I ever said that I did. The misunderstanding is due to the insertion of the phrase : "of canon 1410", but it is "Parochus" who makes the insertion, not I. I make a distinction between the "*oblationes fidelium*" of canon 1410, which, if ecclesiastical authority has so decreed, can constitute the *dos beneficii*, and the offerings of the faithful (offertories, outdoor collections, etc.) which, in actual and normal practice here in England, constitute, indeterminate, both the *dos beneficii* and the *dos ecclesiae*.

"Parochus", as far as I can judge from the opening sentence of his fourth paragraph, himself admits this distinction. Where we differ is in this : "Parochus" apparently interprets the "*fidelium oblationes*" of canon 1410 as referring to the "ordinary Sunday and Holyday offertories" (i.e. exclusive of outdoor collections, etc.), and takes canon 1410 as declaring, not that these "offertories" can constitute his benefice, but that they *do*. I reject both these interpretations. The purpose of canon 1410 was to break away from the tradition of stable endowments, consisting of funded property or "*debitae praestationes*", and to give the term *dos beneficii* a more elastic connotation, in view of modern circumstances. It simply declares that, henceforth, such voluntary (as opposed to due) offerings of the faithful (of any kind) as pertain to the rector, can constitute his benefice, i.e. the source from which he derives his honest maintenance. It does not settle which part or what amount of these voluntary offerings "pertain to the rector", but leaves that to be decided by the local ecclesiastical authority. Our local English custom, established at Westminster under admittedly different and yet analogous circumstances, assesses the parish priest's portion as that amount which he requires for honest maintenance. In my opinion, it is a wise assessment. Our bishops can and may decide to make the Sunday offertory constitute the

parish priest's benefice, as, I understand, was done in Australia. If they do, no one will be better off personally, because no beneficiary can appropriate more than is necessary to honest maintenance, and, on the other hand, many will find themselves harder hit than under the present dispensation, which allows them to draw their keep from the sum total of all offerings.

(2) Dr. Butterfield writes :

In his article on Parochial Benefices Dr. McReavy gave it as the opinion of responsible canonists (which he elevated into the teaching of the Church), that Decree VIII of the Westminster Synod had legal force in determining the *dos beneficii* of parishes. On this false assumption the serious conclusions of his article were based.

He now has the courage to admit that the Synod has no legal force. He apparently sees that he misunderstood the opinion of responsible canonists (and the teaching of the Church !) What, then, of the conclusions he drew from this false premiss ? What is now the value of his article ?

He now ceases to give the opinion of responsible canonists and we have only his own ideas to deal with. These are, "I do most strongly maintain that the decree is still of value, at least as an interpretative guide . . . we must continue to accept this guidance as authoritative and official . . ." I wonder, must we ? Let us remember this cardinal fact that the Westminster decree is concerned with missions and missionary rectors ; it says not one word about parishes and parochial benefices. Why should we accept its guidance with regard to benefices ? The canons quoted by Dr. McReavy to foist this guidance upon us would apply only if parishes were the same thing as missions or in any way similar. Only to the superficial and the inexperienced are they similar. Canonically, parishes are utterly different from missions with a legislation all their own.

Special pleading embodied in rhetorical questions, expressions of horror that "there is no law", and in sentences beginning "Surely . . ." is not the language of the canonist. Quite unemotionally I state the cold fact that the Westminster decree has no legal value in determining the *dos beneficii*. Dr. McReavy's conclusions have therefore no

value at all. Possibly the decree might be of use as a guide ; but then, so might a book on golf. Unless he can prove that the Westminster decree has legal force, etc., etc. Do I make myself clear ?

Dr. McReavy writes in reply :

"Quite unemotionally", to use his own words, Dr. Butterfield repeats the objection which he raised in the January issue of this review. In answer to his closing question, I can assure him that he made himself clear the first time, and therefore I can only repeat, equally unemotionally, the answer which I then gave, because I still consider it to be quite adequate.

Space does not allow me to name all the "responsible canonists" who see in canon 6 an endeavour to preserve, as far as possible, continuity in law and respect for traditional institutions. It has been carried *nem. con.* Now, among other things, Westminster decreed what amount of the offerings of the faithful were to be regarded as meant for the rector of a mission. When, in due course, these missions became parochial benefices, the question arose : what portion of the offerings of the faithful "pertain to the rector of the benefice", and so, by canon 1410, constitute his *dos beneficii* ? The Code does not settle the point. Canon 1410 does not say that the offerings of the faithful belong to the rector : it merely says that those offerings of the faithful which *do* belong to the rector, can (provided, of course, that they are sufficient) constitute his benefice, and leaves the decision and the apportionment to the local ecclesiastical authority. The apportionment made by Westminster for missionary rectors is sufficient to constitute a *dos beneficii* in accordance with canon 1410 ; it is the only official apportionment we have ; it is not *contrary* to the Code, and therefore, until the Bishops decide otherwise, we must abide by it.

I would, indeed, be "superficial" and "inexpert" if I imagined missions and parishes to be more or less the same thing, but I am sure that Dr. Butterfield will believe me when I tell him that I do not. At the same time, I cannot admit his assertion that they are *utterly* different. They are related as stages in the growth of the one body, as adolescence to maturity, sufficiently analogous, beyond all

doubt, to justify my appeal to the principle of canon 20, that "when an express prescription of law, general or particular, is lacking on a particular matter, the rule must be drawn from laws passed 'in similibus'." The Code does not say: "in iisdem adiunctis", and if Dr. Butterfield does not admit a sufficient similarity, I do, and it is no use arguing the point further. We must agree to differ.

[This correspondence is now closed.—EDITOR.]

### GRADINES

Father J. D. Crichton writes :

In E. J. M's. reply to a query about gradines (C. R., Feb., p. 163), there would seem to be a certain amount of confusion, due not to E. J. M. but to the nature of the laws he has to interpret. He points out the inconsistencies between the rubrics of the *Caer. Episc.* and a recent instruction of the *Congregation of the Sacraments*. There is a further difficulty he does not mention. One has been instructed with monotonous frequency that every tabernacle must have a conopaeum and that this must cover the *whole* of the tabernacle, back, front and sides. Repeatedly the S.C.R. has refused permission to dispense with it. It would seem then that this recent instruction is in conflict not with *Caer. Episc.* only (serious though that is) but with a whole body of legislation. Which is to be followed? Or is E. J. M's. interpretation at fault? What does "parieti adverso" (a curious phrase) really mean? I for one would prefer to stick to the law as it has been enforced for so long.

Again as to gradines, one deprecates E. J. M's. compromise. I have never heard of a liturgist who was opposed to attaching the tabernacle to the *Mensa* but I know two who are strongly in favour: (i) *Directions for Use of Altar Societies and Architects* ("semi-official" for this country). "The tabernacle should be on *the table of the altar* (firmly fixed to it), not embedded in a reredos or in gradines. . . ." (Cf. also p. 16 for gradines which he allows but deprecates.) (ii) *The Liturgical Altar*, by Geoffrey Webb, p. 43. Moreover, E. J. M. sees that gradines have grown up as an abuse; what perhaps he failed to see for the moment was



that if one gradine, why not two or three? Why not, indeed! There is no law about it (?), and behold, we are back where we were forty years ago.

I think there must be something wrong with that Instruction of the Congregation of the Sacraments. In any case, E. J. M. has made things either very difficult for us who think *conopaea* are correct or very easy for those who don't. Do we each abound in our own sense?

Canon Mahoney replies :

I find myself largely in agreement with Fr. Crichton. It is not surprising to detect some inconsistencies and conflicts among the thousands of questions which the sacred Congregations have answered during the last couple of hundred years. But I cannot go so far as to say that there is something wrong with the recent Instruction of the *Congregation of the Sacraments*. Another and more likely explanation might be that there is something wrong with the view which always regards a gradine as liturgically monstrous or absurd.

Liturgical laws which originally referred to altars without tabernacles have to be harmonized with the more recent instructions concerning altars with tabernacles, and a compromise, which Fr. Crichton deprecates, is often the only practical solution. I hold no brief for gradines as such, but I suggested that, if the altar has a tabernacle, it is a moot question whether the gradine is a liturgical evil. Moreover, this compromise is not mine, as Fr. Crichton suggests. It is one of the two methods for securing the tabernacle sanctioned by the Holy See in the recent Instruction : "*validis ferreis seris altari debet devinciri in infimo eius gradu aut parieti adverso*". Fr. Crichton prefers a third method, which is permissible though not mentioned in the Instruction, namely, fastening the tabernacle to the *mensa* of the altar. When the law permits alternatives each one may certainly abound in his own sense.

The *conopaeum* is not really so serious a difficulty as Fr. Crichton imagines. If the tabernacle is flush with the wall at the back, the *conopaeum* can cover it only on three sides—a compromise ; if not flush with the wall, but fastened with

a long bolt projecting from the base of the tabernacle, law can be fully observed. "Parieti adverso" may conceivably refer to the rear base of the altar and not the wall at the back ; with a little ingenuity the tabernacle could be thus fixed to the altar, allowing a free passage around it and offering no obstacle whatever to the *complan-*

Both the law and the liturgists regard the *mensa* of altar as a most sacred thing, a mystical symbol of Christ. Gross damage or breakage will desecrate it and make it unfit for use. If holes are pierced through it, or iron staples driven in, the *mensa* is not indeed desecrated thereby, it is surely a regrettable necessity which compels a symbol of Christ to be so treated. "Sit integer, sine ullo scilicet foramine. Id cavet etiam S. Carolus Borromaeus, citatus a Gavanti. Ratio mystica est, ut hic lapis significet plenitudinem et integritatem Christi" (Gasparris, *Eucharistia* § 294). I do not know of any liturgist who forbids fastening the tabernacle to the *mensa* by iron staples. It is lawful but it is a compromise, and it is a matter of opinion whether it is a better compromise than the use of a grating which is expressly sanctioned by the Holy See.

## PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

cle,  
ay  
no  
ern  
pass  
opac  
of  
Chr  
ak  
sta  
y,  
ym  
scil  
cita  
nifi  
ri,  
fort  
I  
pini  
radi